

NIETZSCHE'S PERSPECTIVIST EPISTEMOLOGY: EPISTEMOLOGICAL
IMPLICATIONS OF WILL TO POWER

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

SONER SOYSAL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

FEBRUARY 2007

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnam
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Halil Ş. Turan
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Halil Ş. Turan (METU, PHIL) _____

Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnam (METU, PHIL) _____

Prof. Dr. Harun Tepe (HU, PHIL) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. David Grünberg (METU, PHIL) _____

Dr. Adnan Akçay (METU, SOC) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: SONER SOYSAL

Signature :

ABSTRACT

NIETZSCHE’S PERSPECTIVIST EPISTEMOLOGY: EPISTEMOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF WILL TO POWER

Soysal, Soner

Ph.D., Department of Philosophy

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Halil Ş. Turan

February 2007, 218 pages

The aim of this study is to examine the relation between Nietzsche’s perspectivism and his doctrine of the will to power and to show that perspectivism is almost a direct and natural consequence of the doctrine of the will to power. Without exploring the doctrine, it is not possible to understand what Nietzsche’s perspectivism is and what he trying to do by proposing it as an alternative to traditional epistemology. To this aim, firstly, Nietzsche’s doctrine of the will to power is explained in detail. Next, in order to provide a deeper understanding of the doctrine, its relation with Darwinism and the claims which say that it is a metaphysical principle are analyzed. Afterwards, Nietzsche’s construction of the world as becoming out of will to power is investigated. Nietzsche’s conception of interpretation as power struggle and its role in perspectivism explained. Then, how Nietzsche’s construction of the world as becoming and his concept of interpretation as power struggle emerge as perspectivism is explained. After that, in order to present the differences between Nietzsche’s perspectivism and traditional understanding of epistemology, Nietzsche’s critiques of some of the fundamental assumptions of traditional

epistemology, i.e., causality, logic, and subject-object and apparent-real world distinctions, are investigated. Finally, Nietzsche's understanding of truth based on his perspectivism is inquired. Its relation with correspondence, pragmatic and coherence theories of truth is explored to show that Nietzsche's understanding of truth could not be comprehended through these theories. Consequently, it is claimed that the tendency to attribute a truth theory to Nietzsche's perspectivism, which is prevalent in the current Nietzsche studies, stems from commentator's, consciously or unconsciously, ignoring of the relation between his perspectivism and his doctrine of the will to power.

Keywords: Nietzsche, Will to Power, Interpretation, Perspectivism, Perspectival Epistemology, Epistemology, Truth, Truth Theories, Language, Relativism.

ÖZ

NIETZCSHE’NİN PERSPEKTİVİST EPİSTEMOLOJİSİ: GÜÇ İSTENCI’NİN EPİSTEMOLOJİK İÇERİMLERİ

Soysal, Soner

Doktora, Felsefe Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Halil Ş. Turan

Şubat 2007, 218 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı Nietzsche’nin perspektivizmi ile güç istenci öğretisi arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek ve perspektivizmin neredeyse güç istenci öğretisinin dolaysız ve doğal bir sonucu olduğunu göstermektir. Öğretiyi incelemeden, Nietzsche’nin perspektivizminin ne olduğunu ve bunu geleneksel epistemolojiye bir alternatif olarak ileri sürerken ne yapmaya çalıştığını anlamak olanaklı değildir. Bu amaçla, ilk olarak, Nietzsche’nin güç istenci öğretisi ayrıntılı olarak açıklanmıştır. Devamında, öğretinin daha iyi anlaşılmasını sağlamak için, Darwinizm ile olan ilişkisi ve öğretinin metafizik bir ilke olduğunu ileri süren iddialar incelenmiştir. Sonra, Nietzsche’nin güç istencinden yola çıkarak dünyayı *oluş* şeklinde kurması araştırılmıştır. Nietzsche’nin *yorumu* güç mücadelesi şeklinde anlamasının ve bu anlayışın perspektivizm içerisindeki rolü açıklanmıştır. Daha sonra, Nietzsche’nin dünyayı *oluş* şeklinde kurmasının ve güç mücadelesi olarak *yorum* kavramının nasıl perspektivizm olarak ortaya çıktığı araştırılmıştır. Devamında ise, Nietzsche’nin perspektivizmi ve geleneksel epistemolojik anlayış arasındaki farkı ortaya koyabilmek için, Nietzsche’nin geleneksel epistemolojinin bazı temel varsayımlarına (nedensellik, mantık, özne-

nesne ve görünür-gerçek dünya ayrımları) getirdiği eleştiriler incelenmiştir. Son olarak, Nietzsche'nin perspektivizm üzerine temellenmiş doğruluk anlayışı araştırılmıştır. Nietzsche'nin doğruluk anlayışının karşılıklılık, pragmacılık, ve uygunluk doğruluk kuramları yardımıyla kavranamayacağını göstermek için, Nietzsche'nin doğruluk anlayışı ve bu kuramlar arasındaki ilişki incelenmiştir. Sonuç olarak, günümüz Nietzsche çalışmalarında yaygın olarak görülen Nietzsche'nin perspektivizmine bir doğruluk kuramı atfetme eğiliminin yorumcuların perspektivizm ile güç istenci öğretisi arasındaki ilişkiyi bilinçli ya da bilinçsiz olarak görmezlikten gelmelerinden kaynaklandığı ileri sürülmüştür.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Nietzsche, Güç İstenci, Yorum, Perspektivizm, Perspektif Epistemoloji, Epistemoloji, Doğruluk, Doğruluk Kuramları, Dil, Görecilik.

To My Wife, Deniz

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Halil Ş. Turan for his valuable guidance, comments, and support throughout the development of the present work. I would also like to thank to examining committee members Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnam, Prof. Dr. Harun Tepe, Assoc. Prof. Dr. David Grünberg, and Dr. Adnan Akçay for their criticism and guidance that was absolutely essential to the final form of the work. I am also grateful to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayhan Sol for his valuable suggestions and comments.

I am very grateful to my wife Deniz for her support and tolerance when I was depressed, especially during the last hectic weeks. She has prepared a nice and lovely working environment at home. Without her love and support, the author of this work could not keep his physical and mental health.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. DOCTRINE OF THE WILL TO POWER	11
2.1 Preliminary Notes	11
2.2 What does Nietzsche Mean by Will to Power?	13
2.3 Will to Power and Darwinism	26
2.4 Discussions Concerning the Metaphysical Character of the Will to Power	55
2.4.1 Heidegger's Case: Metaphysics as forgetfulness of Being	59
2.4.2 Richardson's Case: Metaphysics as Essence Claim	77
3. NIETZSCHE'S PERSPECTIVISM	90
3.1 The World as Becoming	92
3.2 Interpretation	96
3.3 Perspectivism	102
3.4 Nietzsche's Perspectivism and Relativism	107
3.5 Logic	117
3.6 Subject-Object Distinction	129
3.7 Apparent-Real World Distinction	135
3.8 Causality	146
4. TRUTH AND CORRESPONDENCE THEORY	156
4.1 Nietzsche's Concept of Truth	156

4.2 Nietzsche and Correspondence Theory of Truth.....	164
4.2.1 Is the Correspondence Theory of Truth Inherent in Nietzsche's Perspectivism?	166
4.2.2 Clark and Convention T: Correspondence, Pragmatic, and Coherence Theories of Truth	168
4.2.3 Truth and Language in a Non-analytic Sense.....	181
5. CONCLUSION	193
REFERENCES	198
APPENDICES	
A. TURKISH SUMMARY	204
CURRICULUM VITAE	217

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A	<i>The Antichrist</i>
BGE	<i>Beyond Good and Evil</i>
BT	<i>The Birth of Tragedy</i>
D	<i>Daybreak</i>
EH	<i>Ecce Homo</i>
GM	<i>On the Genealogy of Morals</i>
GS	<i>The Gay Science</i>
HAH	<i>Human, All too Human</i>
PTAG	<i>Philosophy in the Tragic Age of the Greeks</i>
TI	<i>Twilight of the Idols</i>
TL	“On Truth and Lies in a Nonmoral Sense”
WLN	<i>Writings from the Late Notebooks</i>
WP	<i>The Will to Power</i>
Z	<i>Thus Spoke Zarathustra</i>

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Although Nietzsche's thoughts concerning truth, knowledge and epistemology have remained under the shadow of his thoughts about morality, Christianity, nihilism, politics, women, *Übermensch*, etc., for a long time, they are now becoming the recent topics in Nietzsche studies. As it has been seen in the studies of the former topics, there are also controversial views concerning the latter ones. Some disregard Nietzsche's thoughts as being mere collection of contradictory aphorisms, and as being not clearly expressed ideas, whereas, some argue that there is something novel in those aphorisms concerning our conceptions of truth and knowledge. This fragmentation among ideas concerning the nature and value of Nietzsche's thoughts about truth and knowledge further increases when the investigations are deepened. To illustrate, there appears the problem of *Nachlaß* (unpublished writings), whether Nietzsche's *Nachlaß* is to be taken into consideration or not. Since most of the aphorisms, in which Nietzsche presents his views concerning truth and knowledge, are in the *Nachlass*. Some scholars argue that since Nietzsche did not publish these texts in his lifetime, they are not legitimate sources, on the other hand, some other scholars, claimed that Nietzsche's actual philosophy lies in those texts, and thus, they are legitimate sources. In addition to the problem of the selection of the proper texts, there are also other controversies among Nietzsche scholars resulting from philosophical issues; whether the doctrine of the will to power is a metaphysical, teleological, or Darwinian principle; whether his perspectivism is a kind of relativism; whether his understanding of truth implies a truth theory, etc. Hence, although the issue of Nietzsche's understanding of truth and knowledge is a very fresh topic in Nietzsche studies, it has become a very

controversial and complicated matter; so that, almost every scholar has his own Nietzsche.

Moreover, Nietzsche's style and use of language are other factors that make everything even more controversial and more complex. He does not use clearly present and step by step proceeding arguments, instead he uses metaphors and aphorisms to express his ideas. Furthermore, he does not use the words and concepts in the way we are used to; he plays with words, deforms the established rules of the language. Because he believes that there is a metaphysics inherent in the language, which presupposes an ordered and stable world view, and that this language is not capable of expressing his ideas, which are based on a world view in which everything is in flux resulting from the struggle for power. However, most of the contemporary Nietzsche scholars do not take differences in his use of the language into consideration; thus, they misunderstand, or misinterpret, what he tries to say. In other words, since most of the present day Nietzsche scholars, if not all of them, are from the analytical tradition, and they try to understand what Nietzsche says by linguistic and logical analysis, they fail to appreciate the meaning and importance of the nuances and subtleties of Nietzsche's style and use of language for his philosophy. This failure further leads these scholars to attribute the very things that Nietzsche ceaselessly rejected, e.g., metaphysics, teleology and correspondence theory of truth.

This controversial and complex situation of the contemporary Nietzsche studies concerning his thoughts on the issues of truth and knowledge is important. Further, it was very interesting to see that analytic scholars were trying to understand a philosopher's thought, which was evidently the most un-(or anti-) analytical one that has ever existed in the history of philosophy. Hence, hoping that I could contribute to the solution of above mentioned controversies and complexities, I offer this dissertation about Nietzsche's thoughts concerning truth and knowledge. However, I am aware of the difficulty of the task.

Before going into the details of what is presented throughout this dissertation, I want to mention some of my strategic choices. First of all, since I believe that will to power is the key concept in understanding Nietzsche's

thoughts concerning truth and knowledge, and since most of Nietzsche's thoughts concerning the concept of the will to power are presented in the *Nachlaß*, I choose those part of these writings, which was published under the title of *The Will to Power* as the main reference. Secondly, rather than going into details of the discussions concerning the roots of Nietzsche's thoughts and his main concepts, I preferred to present his views and concepts as presented in both his published and unpublished works, and then, tried to evaluate the interpretations of these thoughts and concepts by Nietzsche scholars. I chose to divide my dissertation into three chapters, in which the key concepts of Nietzsche's thoughts concerning truth and knowledge are explored; these are, will to power, perspectivism, and truth.

In the second chapter, I try to present Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power as it is revealed in his texts. Since, as I have mentioned above, there are controversial views concerning the legitimacy of *Nachlaß* and *The Will to Power* among Nietzsche scholars, I start with a brief presentation of the problem. Although the problem of *Nachlaß* is very important in the sense that if you deny the legitimacy of the unpublished texts, then you will miss a very important part of Nietzsche's philosophy concerning truth and knowledge, I will not fully engage with the problem. Since the main concern of this dissertation is Nietzsche's views on truth and knowledge, I am compelled to accept the legitimacy of those texts. Hence, I only briefly mention the nature of the problem, and also present some of the popular Nietzsche scholars' approaches to the unpublished texts.

Next, I try to give a thorough explanation of the doctrine of the will to power. Throughout my study, I have realized that most Nietzsche scholars either did not understand or misunderstand the concept of the will to power and its importance for Nietzsche's philosophy. Without understanding the importance of this concept for his philosophy, it is impossible to grasp originalities and nuances inherent both in his thought and in his use of language. However, there is no clear definition or explanation of the concept neither in the published nor in the unpublished texts; yet there are passages and aphorisms that give us some idea

about what Nietzsche means by the will to power. In other words, instead of giving a brief description of the concept, Nietzsche tries to explain the concept through showing how the world is constructed out of the dynamic power quanta, which are simply wills to power.

For Nietzsche, everything is simply will to power; that is, whatever exists is a power center either as a quantum or as a constellation of power quanta. Every power center, as a will to power, strives for increasing its power. In order to increase its power, a power center continuously struggles with every other; since power increase is possible only at the expense of others' power. That is, an increase of power occurs through assimilation, appropriation, and domination of the other power center. Hence, there is an ongoing power struggle in the world. As a result of this continuous power struggle, according to Nietzsche, the world is in a constant flux; the world continuously changes, since through power struggle every power center changes; either its power increases or decreases. Thus, for him, the world is not of being, but of becoming.

Furthermore, willing to, or striving for, power is not something external to power centers; that is, will to power is an essential characteristic of a power center. Nietzsche rejects the distinction between the doer and the deed; since such a distinction leads us to the further distinction between the subject and object, which is also rejected by him. As the world is in a flux and everything changes continuously, there could not be anything stable and motionless. However, dividing an act into a doer and a deed means that there is a subject or the agent of deed as something stable apart from its acts. For Nietzsche, such a separation is impossible and an entity is just what it does; in other words, apart from its acts we cannot feel the existence of the entity. Hence, it is in this sense that will to power is an essential characteristic of a power center; that is, a power center is what it does, will to power or striving for power. This is another essential characteristic of the doctrine of the will to power that should be kept in mind.

Through their struggle for power, power centers may constitute constellations like political federations, in which every individual tries to

increase its power by struggling with each other within the constellation while trying to increase the power of the constellation as a whole by struggling with other power centers; to illustrate, for Nietzsche, a body, or a complex organism, is such a constellation. As we will later see in the discussion of the relation between the doctrine of the will to power and Darwinism, Nietzsche explains the formation of organs through struggles between the individual power centers constituting the constellation. Hence, the struggle for power continues everywhere and at any moment without any interruption or reaching any permanent equilibrium. Further, a power center may risk its preservation for increasing its power; that is, for Nietzsche, power increase is more important than self-preservation; a further anti-Darwinian theme in the doctrine of the will to power.

Another important point concerning his doctrine is that there is no distinction between the organic and inorganic entities. For Nietzsche, they are both wills to power and the only difference among them is the difference between quantities of force which they are; in other words, every power center differs from each other with the degree of power which it is. Here I want to emphasize the nuance that I use the verb to “be” instead of to “have,” since power is not something you have, since you are just that power, or you are just that quantity or degree of power. This is the most important point from which most of the controversies concerning the doctrine arise.

After presenting the nature of Nietzsche’s doctrine of the will to power through discussing these and other important features of the doctrine, I will proceed to evaluation of some important claims, which are the sources of some controversies among the Nietzsche scholars, concerning the nature of the doctrine.

Some scholars regard the doctrine of the will to power as a Darwinian principle. However, such an understanding of the doctrine misses the point. Since, in spite of the similarities, there are also some fundamental and deep differences between the doctrine of the will to power and Darwinism. Furthermore, Nietzsche harshly criticizes Darwin and Darwinism; especially,

Darwinian concepts of adaptation, survival of the fittest, struggle for existence, Darwin's views concerning morality, and the teleology inherent in Darwin's theory of evolution are the main targets of his attacks. Referring to these critiques and the doctrine of the will to power, I will try to show that the doctrine could in no way be a Darwinian principle.

Next, I concentrate upon the claims that present the doctrine as a metaphysical principle. Again, Nietzsche is faced with a claim that is directly opposed to what he says. Nietzsche ceaselessly criticizes and rejects every kind of metaphysics and metaphysical systems, yet this does not prevent some philosophers and scholars to claim that Nietzsche is a metaphysician and his doctrine of the will to power is a metaphysical principle. It is very interesting to see that this charge of metaphysics comes from two different and opposing traditions of philosophy; namely, continental and analytic traditions. Therefore, I felt compelled to refer to the views represented by both camps; thus, I choose Martin Heidegger as the representative of the continental tradition and John Richardson as that of analytic tradition. I know that this decision may not be fully legitimate for a philosophical argumentation, since there may be fundamental differences among philosophers belonging to the same tradition, but still, I believe that exploring both interpretations of Nietzsche as a metaphysician would contribute our understanding of the notion of will to power. In investigating both commentator's claims, I first try to present their arguments in some detail, then to show that their arguments are not strong and persuasive enough to make Nietzsche a metaphysician.

In the third chapter, I deal with Nietzsche's perspectivism, which is based on his doctrine of the will to power. The most important point in Nietzsche's perspectivism is the concept of interpretation. Perspectivism could be summarized as the view which claims that our truths are nothing but perspectival interpretations. The term interpretation, in its ordinary use, implies an intellectual activity. However, for Nietzsche, it is the way through which a power center exerts and increases its power. Through interpretation, a power center arranges, shapes, assimilates, and determines its environment and the world so as to

increase its power; that is, every power center interprets or structures the world and its environment from the perspective of power increase. Hence, the world is nothing but the totality of the interpretations made from the perspective of power increase by the power centers.

Every interpretation brings a change in the powers of the parties involved; that is, since interpretation is made from the perspective of power increase, and a power increase is only possible at the expense of a decrease in others' power; hence, through interpretation some power centers' power decrease, while some others' increase. This change in the degree of powers of power centers implies a change in the world, which means that the world is not in that situation when the interpretation is made; hence, it requires a new interpretation. Therefore, interpretation is a continuous process, which gives the world character of becoming.

This dynamic world conception destroys our traditional cognitive paradigm, which regards truth as correspondence to the facts or reality; correspondence presupposes a stable and ordered world view, yet, now we have a fluxing one. Hence, our truths concerning the nature of the world become illusions in the sense that they correspond to nothing. According to Nietzsche, all of our truths are just interpretations, nothing more. Thus, designating them as absolute and unchanging truths prevents us from increasing our power. For Nietzsche, our clinging to such absolute truths is the sign of our cowardice and weakness; realizing that our truths maintain our survival, we stick to them at the expense of further increase of our power, which requires risking self-preservation. Hence, Nietzsche, seeing this life castrating effects of our absolute truths, tries to destruct our epistemological paradigm that leads to such absolute truths through his perspectivism.

Nietzsche presents his perspectivism as an innovation and as an alternative to epistemology. Although, there is no clear definition of perspectivism in his published or unpublished texts, we could understand what he means by perspectivism from those passages in which he refers to it. The basic claim of perspectivism is that there is no absolute truth, and all of our

truths are perspectival interpretations. Actually, perspectivism seems to be the direct consequence of Nietzsche's construction of the world as becoming through the doctrine of the will to power and interpretation. Since the world is in a constant flux, there is no way to attain absolute truths; hence, our truths concerning the world are simply our interpretations of the world from the perspective of increasing our power. Moreover, such an understanding of truth, as perspectival interpretation, requires a criterion of truth other than correspondence. Nietzsche proposes a criterion, which is also fully compatible with the doctrine of the will to power, namely, power increase; for him, an interpretation is true if it increases the power of the interpreter. Thus, Nietzsche's perspectivism is directly opposed to, or undermines our traditional understanding of truth.

Nietzsche's perspectivism carries the tone of relativism. However, when we take Nietzsche's construction of the world as will to power into consideration, it becomes evident that perspectivism has nothing to do with relativism. Relativism accepts the existence of objective reality, and claims that this objective reality could only be attained from a viewpoint which is not available to man; hence, all beliefs and ideas concerning this objectivity are equally true in the sense that all of them are false. Yet, the doctrine of the will to power prevents us from speaking of the existence and the attainability of the objective reality. Additionally, Nietzsche's perspectivism has a criterion of truth which makes a differentiation between good and bad interpretations possible. I discuss the relation between Nietzsche's perspectivism and relativism by referring to Peter Poellner's accusation of perspectivism as being a kind of relativism, in Chapter 3.

In the remainder of the third chapter, in order to provide a better understanding of Nietzsche's perspectivism, I try to present Nietzsche's refutations of the fundamental assumptions and components of our traditional epistemological paradigm, i.e., causality, subject-object and apparent-real world distinctions, and logic, while dealing with perspectivism.

In the fourth chapter, I investigate Nietzsche's conception of truth, his contradictory statements concerning truth, and the relation between his conception of truth and other truth theories. I will deal firstly with Nietzsche's contradictory statements about truth, which are other sources of controversies that are prevalent in the domain of current Nietzsche studies. There are both affirmative and negative statements concerning the existence and the value of truth in Nietzsche's texts. I try to show that the contradiction is only apparent by demonstrating that in those affirmative statements Nietzsche uses the concept of truth in accordance with his criterion of truth; that is, he refers to provisional truths, not to absolute ones. However, in those negative statements, he refers to the so-called absolute truths, which require a stable world order.

After eliminating this apparent contradiction, I proceed to investigate if Nietzsche's perspectivism implicitly assumes a truth theory, such as, correspondence, coherence, or pragmatic theories of truth. Correspondence theory of truth is the most popular one among the contemporary Nietzsche scholars; therefore it is the main concern of my investigation. I start with a brief comparison with Nietzsche's concept of perspectival truth and the correspondence theory in order to emphasize the fundamental differences between perspectival truth and the truth that is designated by the correspondence theory. Next, I continue to inquire whether Nietzsche has a truth theory inherent in his perspectivism through analyzing Maudemarie Clark's attribution of correspondence. I chose Clark's attribution for several reasons. Firstly, her argument is very interesting and shows the tendencies of the analytic scholars when dealing with Nietzsche: Clark does not even refer to Nietzsche's own texts throughout her argumentation. Secondly, related with the first, she uses Tarski's Convention T and the equivalence principle derived from this convention to subject Nietzsche to correspondence theory. Thirdly, in the course of her argumentation, Clark also eliminates coherence and pragmatic theories by applying the principle of equivalence. These and other properties make Clark's argumentation a fruitful topic for my investigation.

Through the principle of equivalence, which claims that a statement is true iff that statement is a true statement in the language in which it is uttered, Clark tries to compel Nietzsche to use the concepts and words in accordance with their ordinary use. To show the inapplicability of her argumentation based on linguistic analysis, I present Nietzsche's genealogical analysis of language as offered in his TL. In this essay, Nietzsche claims that at the origin of language there lies a peace treaty among the individuals, and truth and lie are determined through this treaty; a statement is true if it is constructed according to the rules of the treaty, otherwise it is a lie. This shows us that through a linguistic analysis we could only test if the given statement complies with the rules of the treaty or not, and nothing more. There, Nietzsche further shows us that our words and concepts had been mere aphorisms, and they could in no way correspond to the world in its actual existence. Hence, Clark's argumentation fails to make Nietzsche a correspondence theorist. Subsequently, I analyze Clark's refutations of pragmatic and coherence theory of truths, in which she uses the equivalence principle. While investigating her arguments against those alternative theories of truth, I try to oppose those theories by referring to Nietzsche's perspectivism.

Lastly, further elaborating Nietzsche's thoughts concerning the relation between language and truth as developed in TL, I conclude Chapter 4 by trying to answer the question "Does Nietzsche have a truth theory?" I know this question is too difficult and complicated to be answered in a conclusive way, as it is evident from the fact that various truth theories have been attributed to Nietzsche. However, I believe that Nietzsche's concern is to show the life-negating effects of our absolute (human, all too human) truths, rather than to provide us with a truth theory.

CHAPTER II

DOCTRINE OF THE WILL TO POWER

2.1 Preliminary Notes

The doctrine of the will to power is one of the most elemental doctrines of Nietzsche's philosophy. However, in his published works, we cannot find a complete or satisfactory explanation of the doctrine. Actually, there are only a few occurrences of the will to power in these works.¹ Yet, this doctrine occupies a great part of his unpublished notes, some of which are compiled as a book under the title of *The Will to Power* by his sister Elizabeth Foster-Nietzsche. Because of this fact, there is an ongoing dispute among Nietzsche scholars concerning the importance of both *The Will to Power*, or *Nachlaß*, and the doctrine of the will to power for his philosophy.² However, I will not involve in

¹ Some of the occurrences of the phrase 'will to power,' where Nietzsche presents it as the essence or principle of life, are: "[w]here I found the living, there I found will to power," (Z, part II, "On Self-Overcoming," p. 226) and "[o]nly where there is life is there also will: not will to life but . . . will to power," (*Ibid.* p. 226); "life itself is *will to power*," (BGE, §13) and "[t]he world viewed from inside, the world defined and determined according to its 'intelligible character'—it would be 'will to power' and nothing else," (BGE, §36); "in all events a *will to power* is operating," (GM, II, §12); "the will to power . . . is the will of life," (GS, §349); "[I]f itself is to my mind the instinct for growth, for durability, for an accumulation of forces, for *power*: where the will to power is lacking there is decline," (A, 6). There are also other occurrences of the phrase, yet only a phrase, which does not present the importance of the doctrine for Nietzsche.

² According to Walter Kaufmann, Nietzsche was, actually, planning to write a book under this title, yet he abandoned his plan in 1888. In his notes, Kaufmann says, there are drafts for the title page of the book, and in some of those drafts Nietzsche put a subtitle to the book, "*Revaluation of All Values*." Later, this subtitle becomes the title of another book project. Kaufmann states that Nietzsche was planning to write a four volume book, and in relation this project, Nietzsche considered *The Antichrist*, published in 1888, as the first book of the project. Kaufmann claims that neither his sister, nor the editors and the publishers of the other editions of *The Will to Power*, took these two important projects into consideration seriously. For example, the book was published in 1901, soon after his death, by his sister. However, the aphorisms and notes in this edition were arranged according to a four-line draft, which was discarded by Nietzsche. According to Kaufmann, this draft was very brief and earliest of all the other drafts (Kaufmann mentions the existence of approximately twenty five drafts). There are other editions of the book compiled by different editors and publishers in different manners. In all of these editions of the

book, Nietzsche and the book were portrayed differently. For example, Alfred Bäumler, who published his own edition or rather compilation of *The Will to Power* in 1930, portrayed the book as Nietzsche's philosophical *magnum opus*, and being a Nazi, Bäumler used the book as a means for propaganda, and associated Nietzsche's philosophy with Nazism. On the other hand, Karl Schlechta, who published his version of *The Will to Power* in three volumes between 1954 and 1956, claims that there is nothing new in the book, that the thoughts presented in the book were already in the other published books of Nietzsche (See, Walter Kaufmann's introduction to his translation of WP, pp. xvii-xx). As this brief history of the book shows, there were different, if not directly conflicting, approaches to the book and to Nietzsche. This diversity still continues. There are ongoing disputes on the legitimacy of the book as a reference in understanding the doctrine of the will to power. Some claim that because the book was not published by Nietzsche in his lifetime, it must not be considered as legitimate as the published ones. For example, Robert C. Solomon and Kathleen M. Higgins claim that *The Will to Power* "is an alternative source of juicy one-liners, but hardly a 'book,' let alone a masterpiece." (Robert C. Solomon, Kathleen M. Higgins, *What Nietzsche Really Said*, New York: Random House, 2000, p. 83.) Following Solomon and Higgins, Maudemarie Clark claims that "Nietzsche's published writings . . . are far superior sources of his philosophy." (Maudemarie Clark, *Nietzsche on Truth and Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990, p. 25.) Schlechta, as mentioned above, claims that Nietzsche had "expressed himself with complete clarity, beyond any misunderstanding, in the works he published himself or clearly intended for publication. As far as a genuine possibility of understanding, nothing remains to be desired." (Karl Schlechta, *Der Fall Nietzsche: Aufsätze und Vorträge*, Munich, 1959, p. 11, quoted in Wolfgang Müller-Lauter, *Nietzsche: his philosophy of contradictions and the contradictions of his philosophy*, trans. by David J. Parent, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999, p. 125.) Similarly, Arthur Danto says that Nietzsche's "message appears over and over again, so much so that from any random sample of his writings the entirety of his philosophy can almost be constructed . . . New writings may be found and old ones restored, but it is difficult to suppose they will furnish us with a philosophy different in any essential respect from the one we may find by carefully examining what we have." (Arthur Danto, *Nietzsche as Philosopher*, expanded edition, New York: Columbia University Press, 2004, pp. 9-10.) On the other hand, there are some others who claim that *The Will to Power*, or Nietzsche's *Nachlaß*, is a very crucial part of his philosophy. Heidegger states that "Nietzsche's philosophy proper, the fundamental position on the basis of which he speaks . . . in all the writings he himself published, did not assume a final form and was not itself published in any book, neither in the decade between 1879 and 1889 nor during the years preceding. What Nietzsche himself published during his creative life was always foreground . . . His philosophy proper was left behind as posthumous, unpublished work." (Martin Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, trans. by David Farrell Krell, San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991, vol. I, pp. 8-9.) Adrian Delcaro, in his discussion of Heidegger's influence on the place of Nietzsche in the discussion about the technological domination of nature by man, claims that Heidegger's this approach to *Nachlaß* is "a serious mistake." (Adrian Delcaro, *Grounding the Nietzsche Rhetoric on Earth*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004, p. 144.) Müller-Lauter, referring Nietzsche's notes about himself and his writings, agrees with Heidegger. In those notes, Nietzsche presents himself as "the most hidden of all persons," (*Nachlaß*, Nov. 1882-Feb. 1883, 4[120]; KGW VII 1, p. 151.); in another published note from BGE, he says that "one no longer loves one's insight enough once one communicates it," (BGE, §160, p. 91.); in another note from *Nachlaß* (Fall 1887, 9[188]; KGW VIII 2, p. 114.), Nietzsche writes that "I no longer respect the reader: how could I write for readers? . . . But I take notes only for myself." (Müller-Lauter, p. 125.) Kaufmann seems to be between these two camps by saying that "these notes obviously do not represent his final views . . . But it is fascinating to look, as it were, into the workshop of a great thinker." (WP, "Editor's Introduction," p. xvi.) Richard Schacht, being a bit more in the middle of those two camps of interpreters than Kaufmann, claims that *Nachlaß* "can neither be entirely ignored nor easily digested," and adds that "[o]ne cannot know what use he [Nietzsche] might have made of this material [*Nachlaß*]; but this, in my opinion, is no reason to ignore it." (Richard Schacht, *Nietzsche*, London: Routledge, 1985, pp. xi-xii.)

such an inconclusive and unfruitful dispute. Because, I believe that other than the interference of Nietzsche's sister, there is nothing suspicious about the legitimacy of neither *The Will to Power* nor *Nachlaß*. After all, they are Nietzsche writings. Moreover, in this work, my main concern is to investigate Nietzsche's epistemology based on the doctrine of the will to power; therefore, I am already compelled to use his unpublished notes rather than the published ones. Yet, this does not mean that I am deliberately ignoring the books he himself published in his life time; I am not situating *Nachlaß* above them, as Heidegger did. Consequently, I have to note that when I use the phrases "Nietzsche's philosophy," "Nietzsche's thought," and similar others, I will be referring to both Nietzsche's published books and the *Nachlaß*. After having these remarks, let us return to our actual task; the task of exploring Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power; the task of answering the question "What is will to power?"

2.2 What does Nietzsche Mean by Will to Power?

The will to power is the key concept for understanding Nietzsche's theory of knowledge. For him, there is only will to power and nothing else. In *WP* §1067,

In relation with this dispute about the legacy of *The Will to Power* and *Nachlaß*, there is also another dispute about the place and the role of the doctrine of the will to power in Nietzsche philosophy. The interpreters, who accept the importance of *Nachlaß* for Nietzsche's philosophy, also accept the centrality of the doctrine of the will to power to his thought. For example, Heidegger claims that "'will to power' is a fundamental term in the fully developed philosophy of Nietzsche." (Martin Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology, and Other Essays*, trans. by William Lowitt, New York: Harper & Row, 1977, p. 76.) Müller-Lauter shows the importance of the doctrine by refuting Schlechta's claim, based on Nietzsche's use of phrases as "suppose that," "one must venture the hypothesis [...]," etc. in BGE §36, that the will to power is an hypothesis and "[t]hat does not sound very confident for a thought that is supposed to hold up." (Quoted in Müller-Lauter, p. 127.) There are other interpreters, such as Schacht, Gilles Deleuze, Danto, Christoph Cox, even Kaufmann, whose use of the doctrine of the will to power together with references to *Nachlaß* shows their approval of the role of the doctrine. As an extreme case, Bernd Magnus, to support his opposition to use of *Nachlaß* in interpreting Nietzsche, reports that in Schacht's *Nietzsche* "there are 1,718 quotations from Nietzsche in his 546 pages of text. 861 out of 1,718 quotations—more than half—are from the nonbook *Der Wille zur Macht*." (Bernd Magnus, "The Use and Abuse of *The Will to Power*," in Robert C. Solomon, Kathleen M. Higgins (eds.), *Reading Nietzsche*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1990, p. 220.) Finally, together with Higgins, Solomon claims that "most of what Nietzsche says about the will to power is to be found in his unpublished notes, and it is therefore to be regarded with considerable suspicion." (Robert C. Solomon, Kathleen M. Higgins, *What Nietzsche Really Said*, p. 216.)

he asks “do you know what ‘the world’ is to me? Shall I show it to you in my mirror?”³ Next, in a lengthy paragraph, Nietzsche describes the world as he perceived or understood it. The world is a chaos resulting from the struggles of power centers for increasing their power in a universe, which is actually a huge, yet limited, amount of power. The size of the universe, or the amount of power never changes, because it is limited with “nothingness.” While the amount of power increases somewhere in this universe, there is a decrease in another place. Thus the amount of power always remains constant (it sounds like the “law of the conservation of energy”⁴). In the course of power struggles, these power centers reach an equilibrium, but this state of peace does not last forever. It is the power struggle that remains constant in this universe, and chaos and peace circularly follow each other. This circular process lasts forever (as Nietzsche’s doctrine of the “eternal recurrence of the same” suggests).

This world: a monster of energy, without beginning, without end; a firm, iron magnitude of force that does not grow bigger or smaller, that does not expend itself but only transforms itself; as a whole, of unalterable size . . . do you want a name for this world? . . . This world is the will to power—and nothing besides! And you yourselves are also this will to power—and nothing besides!⁵

From this passage, one may infer that will to power is another metaphysical concept in the tradition of Western thought; such as, Hegel’s *Geist* or Spinoza’s God. However, will to power is not a homogenous and changeless world-substance from which everything in the world springs. For example, as the above quotation shows us, will to power may vary from place to place; it is one and the many at the same time, but not the plurality of the identical power

³ WP, §1067, p. 550. Nietzsche’s use of the metaphor of the mirror seems to refer to his notion of perspectivism. His perspectivism will be discussed in the chapter entitled “Nietzsche’s Perspectivism.” Therefore, it is sufficient, for now, to say that perspectivism denies the notion of absolute knowledge, and claims that every individual power center sees and knows other power centers through its perspective towards the others. Here, the mirror through which Nietzsche shows us the world is his perspective through which he sees and knows the world.

⁴ Nietzsche, in the context of eternal recurrence, mentions the law of the conservation of energy. There he says that “[t]he law of conservation of energy demands *eternal recurrence*.” WP, §1063, p. 547.

⁵ WP, §1067, p. 550.

centers, that is, every power center is different from each other; these power centers always change in the course of power struggle among them. However, world-substances of the traditional metaphysics do not and could not change, because, for this tradition change is an indication of imperfection and deficiency. Other than these differences, there is one more reason for the will to power's not being a metaphysical notion; Nietzsche's aim was to destruct traditional Western Metaphysics. As an opponent of the traditional metaphysics, it would be naïveté to expect from Nietzsche to propose another version of the same metaphysics. Nietzsche's wanted to show that in reality there is no such thing as "Being" on which this tradition was constructed. Against the construction of reality as Being, Nietzsche proposed reality as becoming. As our investigation about the concept of the will to power advances, this point will become more clear.

What is the will to power then? Actually, in Nietzsche's works, there is no clear definition of it, yet there are passages that open a path for us to understand what it is. In one of the those passages, criticizing the mechanistic world view, Nietzsche explains: "The victorious concept 'force,' by means of which our physicists created God and the world, still needs to be completed: an inner will must be ascribed to it, which I designate as 'will to power.'"⁶ Will to power is something essential to, or inseparable from, force. It is not a predicate to be ascribed to the force. It completes the force, not as something external, but as an "internal quality"⁷ of it. Because this internal quality, the will to power, is absent in the mechanistic explanations of the world, physicists could not explain reality by applying the purely mechanistic concept of force; they could only describe the world. Without will to power, concepts and principles applied by physicists have no explanatory power. Nietzsche says the following "[a]ttraction' and 'repulsion' in a purely mechanistic sense are complete fictions: a word. We cannot think of an attraction divorced from an *intention*."⁸

⁶ WP, §619, pp. 332-33.

⁷ WP, §618, p. 332.

⁸ WP, §627, p. 335. In WP §689 (p. 368), Nietzsche writes: "All the presuppositions of mechanistic theory—matter, atom, gravity, pressure and stress—are not 'facts-in-themselves' but interpretations with the aid of physical fictions."

“A force we cannot imagine,” says Nietzsche, “is an empty word and should be allowed no rights of citizenship in science; like the so-called purely mechanistic forces of attraction and repulsion, which are intended to make it possible for us to form an image of the world, no more!”⁹ and asks “the expressibility of all events in formulas—is this really comprehension?”¹⁰ Because this inner quality is operative everywhere and in every event, the world, as well as the organic life, must be understood as the manifestation of the will to power.

[O]ne is obliged to understand all motion, all “appearances,” all “laws,” only as symptoms of an inner event and to employ man as an analogy to this end. In the case of animal, it is possible to trace all its drives to the will to power; likewise all the functions of organic life to this one source.¹¹

Thus, the world is composed of such forces or quanta of forces, which have an inner will. These forces are related to each other by a tension resulting from their essential drive to increase their power. And, the essence of a force quantum is this relation; “their essence lies in their relation to all other quanta.”¹² It is this relation that determines a force quantum. Because, “it is only relations that constitute an essence.”¹³ In their struggle for power, every force quantum affects the others, and is also affected by them.

Here, we are faced with the problem of differentiating the force quanta. That is, if it is the force that exists in the world, then how can we be able to discern anything from the rest of the world? Or, to put it in another way, how do those force quanta appear as distinct entities, which interact with each other? In what way, do they appear as separate entities having different qualities? At this point, to appeal to Gilles Deleuze’s discussion of the doctrine of the will to power, in his *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, may be very helpful. His analysis, or reconstruction, of the will to power is very illuminating to understand

⁹ WP, §621, p. 333.

¹⁰ WP, §624, p. 334.

¹¹ WP, §619, p. 333.

¹² WP, §635, p. 339.

¹³ WP, §625, p. 334.

Nietzsche's conceptions of the will to power, force quantum and its relations with other power quanta. Roughly put, according to Deleuze, when two quanta of force enter into a relation they constitute a body based on a hierarchical structure; one dominates the other. In this hierarchy of the forces, the dominating quantum is known as the *active* and the dominated one as the *reactive* one. These are original qualities of force quanta; this is due to their quantitative differences from each other, which become apparent only when they enter into relation. In other words, the essence of a force quantum is its quantitative difference from the other quantum of force, and this quantitative difference is the quality of that quantum of force. This quantitative difference becomes apparent when two quanta of force enter into relation. However, this explanation of the qualities of a force quantum should not be understood as the reduction of qualities to quantities. Because, such a reduction is simply a product of the mechanistic world view, which tries to eliminate all differences and wants equality. Deleuze emphasizes that, for Nietzsche, quantitative difference and quantity are very different and cannot be thought as being equal. Because quantitative difference is *quality*, and it cannot be reduced, or made equal, to any other qualitative difference, or quantity.¹⁴

The only difference among force quanta is quantitative difference related to their strength or energy, there is no qualitative difference. As Deleuze points out, in his explanation of what separates, or differentiates, a quantum of force from every other quantum, quantity is always quantity in difference. That is, "[i]f a force is inseparable from its quantity it is no more separable from the other forces which it relates to. *Quantity itself is therefore inseparable from difference in quantity*," and this difference in quantity becomes "the essence of force and of the relation of force to force."¹⁵ Deleuze, also, notes that Nietzsche, by quantity, does not mean the purely abstract concept of quantity of the mechanistic world view, which tries to reduce quality to quantity. Nietzsche rejects such a reduction

¹⁴ See, Gilles Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1983, pp. 39-42.

¹⁵ Deleuze, p. 43.

and claims that “in a purely quantitative world everything would be dead, stiff, motionless.—The reduction of all qualities to quantities is nonsense: what appears is that the one accompanies the other, an analogy.”¹⁶ The difference in quantity is the quality of the force, and it appears only when the force is in relation to other force. It is will to power that generates this difference in quantity. This inner will, which is “an insatiable desire to manifest power” or “the employment and exercise of power, as a creative drive,”¹⁷ determines the relation among force quanta. The essence of a force quantum is its relation with others, and this inner will, the will to power is what determines this relation, and hence what determines the quantum of force. Therefore, will to power is the source of the difference in quantity and the quality of the forces. As Deleuze puts it, the will to power is “the genealogical element of force, both differential and genetic . . . *the element from which derive both the quantitative difference of related forces and the quality that devolves into each in this relation.*”¹⁸ Will to power determines a force quantitatively and qualitatively. By this determination it also determines itself.

Because of this inner will, the will to power, Nietzsche’s force is different from that of the mechanistic world view. Because it is dynamic; it is essentially dynamic; its dynamism comes from itself, not from outside. When we eliminate the “fictions” added by the mechanistic theory, i.e., concepts “number,” “the thing,” “the subject,” “motion,” and “activity,” “no things remain but only dynamic quanta, in relation of tension to other dynamic quanta.”¹⁹ It is will to power that make a quantum of force dynamic. These additions, for Nietzsche, are the result of the tendency to make the world a calculable unity; a tendency to make the world a unity of causal chains expressible in terms of numbers, laws, and formulas, etc. To make the world a causal chain, mechanistic theory makes a distinction between cause and effect, a distinction between the

¹⁶ WP, §564, p. 304.

¹⁷ WP, §619, p. 333.

¹⁸ Deleuze, p. 50.

¹⁹ WP, §635, p. 339.

subject and the object in every event. However, for Nietzsche, there is no such distinction; it is not real, it is imposed upon us by the language we use: “Subject, object, a doer added to the doing, the doing separated from that which it does: let us not forget that this is mere semeiotics and nothing real.”²⁰ Therefore, the dynamic quantum is what it does:

A quantum of force is equivalent to a quantum of drive, will, effect—more, it is nothing other than precisely this very driving, willing, effecting, and only owing to the seduction of language (and of the fundamental errors of reason that are petrified in it) which conceives and misconceives all effects as conditioned by something that causes effects, by a “subject,” can it appear otherwise.²¹

As stated earlier, for Nietzsche, the world, or the reality, is the will to power and nothing besides, and “all driving force is will to power . . . there is no other physical, dynamic or psychic force except this.”²² Every entity, organic or inorganic, is a quantum or quanta of power. These power centers are in a constant struggle with each other to increase their power. However, as there is enormous yet limited amount of power, an increase in the power of any power center is only possible at the expense of others’ power. A power center increases its power by assimilating, appropriating and dominating the other power centers in its neighborhood. Because every power center is this essential, or natural will to increase its power, they may constitute constellations or unions to increase their powers collectively. However, this constellation is not a homogenous one. It is a constellation in which every member is present as an individual pursuing to increase its own power through this constellation. That is, it is not assimilated into the constellation. This is actually what Nietzsche means when he describes world as being “at the same time one and the many.”²³ Nietzsche explains this formation of the constellation as follows:

²⁰ WP, §634, p. 338.

²¹ BGE I §12, p. 45.

²² WP, §688, p. 366.

²³ WP, §1067, p. 550.

My idea is that every specific body strives to become master over all space and to extend its force (—its will to power:) and thrust back all that resists its extension. But it continually encounters similar efforts on the part of other bodies and ends by coming to an arrangement (“union”) with those of them that are sufficiently related to it: thus they then conspire together for power. And the process goes on.²⁴

Will to power is always active. It always searches for resistance, because it “can manifest itself only against resistances,” otherwise it is inconceivable; “therefore it seeks that which resists it.”²⁵ Every power center is determined through its struggle for power with others. When a power center is confronted with another center, it changes according to the effects it produced on the other party and the effects produced on itself by the other party: “A quantum of power is designated by the effect it produces and that which it resists.”²⁶ That is, in this encounter every party changes and determines the other. Although it is thinkable that those power centers do not affect each other, yet in actuality, it is not the case. Because it is the will to dominate and overwhelm the others, not self-preservation that is the principle operative in the world. Therefore, a quantum of power is “essentially a will to violate and to defend oneself against violation.”²⁷ Moreover, for Nietzsche, a quantum of force affects the whole. Because, Nietzsche denies the existence of empty space, and sees this notion as a fiction and as an erroneous concept of the mechanistic world view.²⁸ For him, because there is no empty space, “every atom affects the whole being”²⁹; the effect of an

²⁴ WP, §636, p. 340.

²⁵ WP, §656, p. 346.

²⁶ WP, §634, pp. 337-38.

²⁷ WP, §634, p. 338.

²⁸ When describing the world through his mirror, Nietzsche rejects the notion of empty space, there he says that the world is “enclosed by ‘nothingness’ as a boundary; not something blurry or wasted, not something endlessly extended, but set in a definite space as a definite force, and not a space that might be ‘empty.’” (WP, §1067, p. 550.) Again, when he writes his forecast about the future of this mechanistic physics, he writes that “the dynamic interpretation of the world, with its denial of ‘empty space’ and its little clumps of atoms, will shortly come to dominate physicists.” (WP, §618, p. 332.)

²⁹ WP, §634, p. 338. In another note, Nietzsche writes: “Supposing that the world had a certain quantum of force at its disposal, then it is obvious that every displacement of power at any point

atom on another radiates through the whole. If any one denies this radiation of “power-will,” one denies the whole being, or existence. This is the reason for Nietzsche’s calling the world a quantum of will to power: “That is why I call it a quantum of ‘will to power.’”³⁰ According to Nietzsche, there is no order in the world. The mechanistic theory was constructed upon “necessity” and “law”; because “[t]hings’ do not behave regularly, according to a *rule*.”³¹ There is no obedience to a rule in any event, it is the “degree of resistance and the degree of superior power”³² that is important for understanding an event. Therefore, to try to understand in terms of necessity and rule means to deny the world; “Physicists believe in a ‘true’ world in their own fashion: a firm systematization of atoms in necessary motion, the same for all beings . . . But they are in error.”³³ The mechanistic theory could not understand the world by its concepts, because the world is a quantum of will to power, which “expresses the characteristic that cannot be thought out of the mechanistic order without thinking away this order itself.”³⁴ Hence, the world is a quantum of will to power as a unity of other quanta of will to power, in which every quantum of will to power affects each other and the whole. It is not a homogenous unity of similar atoms, which are essentially and universally ordered by necessity and laws. It is a unity of unequal power centers struggling incessantly with each other for more power. It is this struggle that characterizes the world; that is, the world is the will to power.

Every power center has different degrees of power. Therefore, their effects on each other vary with regard to these power differences. That is, a power center may have a small effect on another center which has great power, and big effects on a center of power which has little power. Because of this, every power center treats and understands every other differently. In other

would affect the whole system—thus together with sequential causality there would be a contiguous and concurrent dependence.” (WP, §638, p. 340.)

³⁰ WP, §634, p. 338.

³¹ WP, §634, p. 337.

³² WP, §634, p. 337.

³³ WP, §636, p. 339.

³⁴ WP, §634, p. 338.

words, a power center looks differently to every other center with regard to the differences in their degree of power. This means that, each quantum of power knows each other differently with respect to the differences in the degree of power between them. For example, a power center may perceive one power center as strong, while another power center perceives the very same center of power as weak.

Will to power is not something from which things or entities take their share. It is not a property that things have or have not. A thing is just a quantum or quanta of the will to power, and a quantum or quanta of power is the very thing that it does; it is exactly what it does. A power center, an entity is the totality of all its effects on other power centers and others' effect on it. "A 'thing' is the sum of its effects, synthetically united by a concept, an image."³⁵ In fact, for Nietzsche, there is no entity which is inactive and without relations; actually, an inactive and unchanging entity without relations corresponds to the famous Kantian thing-in-itself (*noumenon*), which is, to Nietzsche, impossible. He claims that "[t]he properties of a thing are effects on other 'things': if one removes other 'things,' then a thing has no properties i.e., there is no thing without other things, i.e., there is no 'thing-in-itself',"³⁶ and adds that "[t]he 'thing-in-itself' nonsensical. If I remove all the relationships, all the 'properties,' all the 'activities' of a thing, the thing does not remain over."³⁷

Nietzsche's explanation of the will to power seems as if about the organic world. Because, he speaks of drives, wills etc. However, when he talks about will to power, he makes no distinction between organic and inorganic.³⁸

³⁵ WP, §551, p. 296.

³⁶ WP, §557, p. 302.

³⁷ WP, §558, p. 302.

³⁸ According to Danto, this rejection of the distinction between the organic and the inorganic worlds is a typical example of Nietzsche's "methodological monism." Danto defines this monism as follows: "[r]epeated in connection with each pair of allegedly distinct pairs, we press toward a single principle in connection with which all may be treated as of a piece. This is Methodological Monism, as one might term it." He says that the general outline of the program is the following: "step by step we reduce all problems to psychological ones; and reduce all psychology to a psychology of the unconscious, instinctual life, which courses on fundamentally in the same way, however it may be modified for this or that form of conscious life." (Danto, p. 198.)

Because, for him, there is no inorganic matter as something dead; “‘Being’—we have no other idea of this than ‘*living*’. How, then, something dead ‘be.’”³⁹ Furthermore, will to power is the guiding principle in both organic and inorganic worlds, and because of this, such a distinction is meaningless. It is a prejudice, because “[t]he drive to approach—and the drive to thrust something back are the bond, in both inorganic and organic world.”⁴⁰ The only difference between a living organism and an inorganic matter is the quantity in difference and the quality resulting from this difference. That is, they are essentially the same; they are manifestations of the will to power. Yet, with regard to the degree of power or force which they *are*, and with regard to their complexity, the organic and inorganic differs from each other. In other words, what we call an organism is more complex, diverse, and powerful than an inorganic entity. Nonetheless, they both are will to power. Let us emphasize we cannot say that an entity, organic or inorganic, *has* will to power. Because, for Nietzsche, an entity, organic or inorganic, is just a will to power; will to power is not a property or quality that some entities have and others do not have.

According to Nietzsche, life is “merely a special case of the will to power,”⁴¹ with which we are most familiar. As we have seen already,⁴² Nietzsche proposed to employ man as an analogy to understand what the will to power is. Man as a living organism, and also as social entity, shows us how the will to power operates. Nietzsche speaks of an aristocracy in the body, which results from the “struggle between cells and tissues.”⁴³ The result of this struggle is the division of labor; the powerful subjugates the weak, and the weak becomes a function. Nietzsche defines life as a “multiplicity of forces, connected by a common mode of nutrition.”⁴⁴ Thus, the body is also such a common mode of nutrition, in which every cell, as a quantum of the will to power, works

³⁹ WLN, 2[172], p. 94.

⁴⁰ WP, §655, p. 346.

⁴¹ WP, §692, p. 369.

⁴² See, WP, §624, p. 334.

⁴³ WP, §660, p. 349.

⁴⁴ WP, §641, p. 341.

according to its task defined through the division of the labor for the increase of power both of the body and of itself. This common mode of nutrition is not the aim, or the drive to form a constellation; it is the will to power, will to ever more power. Let us recall that it is not the self preservation but the will to power that is operative in both organic and inorganic worlds. Therefore, “[o]ne cannot ascribe the most basic and primeval activities of protoplasm to a will to self-preservation, for it takes into itself absurdly more than would be required to preserve it.”⁴⁵ As a common mode of nutrition, the body, or the organism, has some features, which make them possible, common to all organic power constellations. “(1) a resistance to all other forces; (2) an adjustment of the same according to form and rhythm; (3) an estimate in regard to assimilation or excretion.”⁴⁶ Then, an organism is a multiplicity of power quanta organized into a common mode of nutrition under the guidance, or dominance, of the higher and superior cells, or power quanta.

As a highly complex organism, the same applies also to man. As he is very complex, there are many other drives or wills along with the will to power; i.e., sex drive, hunger drive, etc. However, these drives are nothing more than a manifestation of the will to power. They are only derivative drives, and therefore, cannot be the guiding principle in the organism. For example, hunger is the manifestation of the fundamental desire to incorporate everything, not to supply the organism with what is required for its subsistence; hunger drive is only a side effect, or derivative, of the will to power. This can be seen, for Nietzsche, in the nourishment of protoplasm: it “extends its pseudopodia in search for something that resists it—not from hunger but from will to power. Thereupon, it attempts to overcome, appropriate, assimilate what it counters: what one calls ‘nourishment’ is merely is a derivative phenomenon.”⁴⁷

Moreover, neither the utilitarian principle of pleasure, which is simply the tendency to seek pleasure and avoid displeasure, can be the principle of life.

⁴⁵ WP, §651, p. 345.

⁴⁶ WP, §641, p. 342.

⁴⁷ WP, §702, p. 373.

Actually, those thoughts, i.e., hedonism, utilitarianism, eudaemonism, which take pleasure and pain as the principle of life, are regarded as naïvetés by Nietzsche.

Whether it is hedonism or pessimism, utilitarianism or eudaemonism—all these ways of thinking that measure the value of things in accordance with *pleasure* and *pain*, which are mere epiphenomena and wholly secondary, are ways of thinking that stay in the foreground and naïvetés on which everyone conscious of *creative* powers and an artistic conscience will look down not without derision, nor without pity.⁴⁸

For Nietzsche, pleasure is only a function of the will power; or rather it is a consequence of will to power. Pleasure, as well as displeasure, are accidental and depend on a value judgment of the will to power. Pleasure is the feeling of increase of power in the organism. Man does not want something because it is pleasant, but he finds it pleasant because of the possible increase in his power. “Pleasure and displeasure,” Nietzsche writes, “are mere consequences, mere epiphenomena—what man wants, what every smallest part of a living organism wants, is an increase of power.”⁴⁹ Pleasure and displeasure appear as the result of the struggle for increasing power; every increase in power gives rise to pleasure while every decrease leads to displeasure. However, according to Nietzsche, displeasure is, at the same time, a stimulant for increasing of power. In this sense, displeasure becomes the condition of pleasure. In other words, an organism increases its power by overcoming what resists it, and this resistance means, for the organism, displeasure, or a source of pain. However, when it overcomes the resistance, its power increases; hence the feeling of increased power, pleasure.

Displeasure, as an obstacle to its will to power, is therefore a normal fact, the normal ingredient of every organic event; man does not avoid it, he is rather in continual need of it; every

⁴⁸ BGE, §225, p. 153. At the same place, Nietzsche emphasizes the same view more directly by saying that “there are higher problems than all problems of pleasure, pain and pity; and every philosophy stops with them is a naïveté.” (*Ibid.*, p. 154.)

⁴⁹ WP, §702, p. 373.

victory, every feeling of pleasure, every event, presupposes a resistance overcome.⁵⁰

Therefore, the pleasure principle is self-contradictory; that is, pleasure cannot be attainable by avoiding displeasure; then, it is impossible to seek pleasure without seeking, at the same time, displeasure.

2.3 Will to Power and Darwinism

The relation between Darwinism and Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power is important for understanding Nietzsche's view concerning the essence of life as will to power. Most of the commentators agree that Nietzsche's philosophy is influenced by Darwin's theory of evolution. However, it is not an easy task to determine the scope of this influence. Because, as in the case of the most of the crucial issues in Nietzsche's philosophy, there are phrases and sentences that will make Nietzsche a Darwinist thinker, yet there are other passages, in which Nietzsche directly attacks Darwin and Darwinism. For example, his concept of the *Übermensch*, which is introduced as the product of an evolutionary process, in *Zarathustra* shows us that Nietzsche believes in evolution: "You have made your way from worm to man, and much in you is still worm. Once you were apes, and even now, too, man is more ape than any ape,"⁵¹ and "[m]an is a rope, tied between beast and overman."⁵² Further, as indicated by Thomas H. Brobjer, his continuous emphasis on struggle and competition in his description of the world as will to power have, "at first glance, much in common with the Darwinian concept of struggle for existence."⁵³ On the other hand, Nietzsche harshly criticizes Darwin's theory of evolution, especially its regarding of the self-preservation and survival as the prime dynamic of the evolutionary process; "our natural sciences have become so thoroughly entangled in the Spinozistic

⁵⁰ WP, §702, p. 373.

⁵¹ Z, "Prologue" §3, p. 124.

⁵² Z, "Prologue" §4, p. 126.

⁵³ Thomas H. Brobjer, "Nietzsche's Reading and Knowledge of Natural Science: An Overview," in *Nietzsche and Science*, eds. Gregory Moore and Thomas H. Brobjer, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2004, p. 23.

dogma (most recently and worst of all, Darwinism with its incomprehensibly one-sided doctrine of the ‘struggle for existence’).”⁵⁴ There are also aphorisms starting with “Against Darwinism” or “Anti-Darwin.”⁵⁵ Additionally, Nietzsche complains that those, who accuse him of being a Darwinian for his account of the concept of the *Übermensch*: “[o]ther scholarly oxen have suspected me of Darwinism on that account.”⁵⁶ By such contradictory evidence, it is difficult to decide whether Nietzsche is a Darwinist thinker or not. However, it is certain that Nietzsche occupied himself with Darwin’s theory and, by attacking some of the main concepts of the theory, i.e., adaptation and natural selection. These attacks, as John Richardson argues by referring to Nietzsche’s aphorism concerning parting, maybe regarded as evidence for Nietzsche’s closeness to Darwin: “Not how one soul comes close to another but how it moves away shows me their kinship and how much they belong together.”⁵⁷ Of course, this does not make Nietzsche a Darwinist thinker. Actually, for the purposes of the present study it is not a crucial question whether Nietzsche is Darwinist or not. What is important is to show that there is a relation between Nietzsche’s philosophy and Darwinian theory of evolution. It is important because, as we will see in the remainder of this section, it will contribute to our discussion of Nietzsche’s doctrine of the will to power, by showing us how the will to power operates in nature as a life principle. I will mainly concentrate upon Nietzsche’s attack on Darwinism, because examining his attack will reveal the originality and the genealogical aspect of the doctrine of the will to power. Before going into the details of his attack, I am going to give a brief summary of the views of Nietzsche commentators concerning Nietzsche’s relation to Darwinism and how Nietzsche become familiar with Darwinism. Afterwards, I am going to present a brief synopsis of the Darwinian evolutionary theory. Finally, I am going to examine and discuss Nietzsche’s attack on Darwinism.

⁵⁴ GS, §349, p. 292.

⁵⁵ See, for example, WP §647, §684, §658, and TI “Skirmishes of an Untimely Man,” §14.

⁵⁶ EH, “Why I Write such good Books,” §1, p. 261.

⁵⁷ “Seventy-five Aphorisms from Five Volumes,” in GM, §251, p. 177.

As a theory, which influenced the whole scientific, intellectual and cultural life of the second half of the 19th century, Darwin's evolutionary theory had considerable influences on the philosophy of Nietzsche. Especially, his doctrines of the will to power and the *Übermensch* are said to be influenced by the theory of evolution. Commentators, studying the relation between Nietzsche's thought and Darwinism, agree on this point. According to Thomas H. Brobjer, Nietzsche's thought is deeply influenced by Darwinism, or the theory of evolution, and without taking this fact and his approach to Darwinism into account, crucial aspects of his philosophy "such as his view of development, progress and history, as well as his concepts of the will to power and the *Übermensch*"⁵⁸ could not be fully understood. Another Nietzsche scholar Keith Ansell-Pearson, emphasizing the Darwinian influences on Nietzsche's philosophy, claims that

at the very heart of Nietzsche's outline of his fundamental concerns in his major text, *On the Genealogy of Morals*, we find a critical engagement with the Darwinian paradigm of evolution. The *Genealogy* is a text steeped in nineteenth-century biological thought and ideas, and unthinkable without this heritage.⁵⁹

Although, influence of Darwinism on the philosophy of Nietzsche is widely recognized, it is not so easy to determine the scope and the extent of this influence. As Dirk Robert Johnson puts it, "many contemporary studies do seem to agree . . . that Darwin's theories decisively influenced Nietzsche at various levels – even though the nature and extent of that influence may still remain indeterminate."⁶⁰ According to Ansell-Pearson, this uncertainty is the result of the fact that Nietzsche's "engagement with Darwin has not received the kind of attention it merits," and "[w]here it has been treated, it has treated cursorily, without any serious effort being made by commentators to render

⁵⁸ Thomas H. Brobjer, p. 22.

⁵⁹ Keith Ansell-Pearson, *Viroid Life: Perspectives on Nietzsche and the Transhuman Condition*, New York: Routledge, 1997, pp. 85-86.

⁶⁰ Dirk Robert Johnson, "Nietzsche's Early Darwinism: The 'David Strauss' Essay of 1873," *Nietzsche-Studien*, 30 (2001), p. 62.

comprehensible Nietzsche's 'philosophical biology', including its problematic aspects."⁶¹ Johnson makes a similar claim; "Darwin's importance for Nietzsche has, indeed, been underestimated and merits critical reassessment."⁶²

Ansell-Pearson is well aware that it is not an easy task to determine Nietzsche's relation to Darwin. He proposes that there are many reasons, which make this task very hard, yet two of them are very important (at least for him). First "the influence of an evolutionary paradigm on Nietzsche's thinking on life is evident as early as 1867 in his speculations on Kant and the question of teleology."⁶³ This means that, this influence had started at the beginning of Nietzsche's academic career, when he was twenty three years old. That is, all of his published and unpublished works might have been influenced by Darwinian theory. Elizabeth Grosz makes an interesting point by calling our attention to the publication dates of both Darwin's *The Descent of Man* and Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy*.⁶⁴

Secondly, one is that when Nietzsche opposes Darwinian ideas in his writings, he is, actually, writing in a way that supports Darwinian theory. That is, "when Nietzsche presents himself as 'contra' Darwin, he is, in fact, frequently writing 'pro' Darwin."⁶⁵ For Ansell-Pearson, this confusion is the result of the fact that Nietzsche never read Darwin, and he knows Darwin from second-hand resources. "There is plenty of evidence to suggest that Nietzsche was familiar with the work of the English Darwinians (and prominent German Darwinians too, such as Ernst Haeckel), but no evidence to suggest that he had any direct

⁶¹ Ansell-Pearson, p. 85.

⁶² Johnson, "Nietzsche's Early Darwinism: The 'David Strauss' Essay of 1873," p. 63.

⁶³ Ansell-Pearson, p. 86 n. 2.

⁶⁴ "Although *The Origin of Species* was published in 1859, when Nietzsche was fifteen, the writings of Nietzsche and Darwin's later works are close in publication dates. Quite fervent discussions around Darwin's writings must have occurred throughout the period of Nietzsche's studies, and Darwinism remained one of the most contested and elaborated theoretical contributions of the nineteenth century. *The Descent of Man* was published in 1871, and *The Birth of Tragedy* was published in 1872." (Elizabeth Grosz, *Nick of Time: Politics, Evolution, and the Untimely*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2004, p. 98.)

⁶⁵ Ansell-Pearson, p. 86.

acquaintance with the work of Darwin itself.”⁶⁶ Grosz, Brobjer, and Daniel Dennett make similar claims, too.⁶⁷

Who are those popularizers of Darwin in Germany, at that time? The first and the most commonly accepted figure is Friedrich Albert Lange. Nietzsche, in 1866, when he was a student, read Lange’s book *History of Materialism*, in which a chapter is devoted to Darwin. At the University of Basel, Nietzsche met paleontologist Ludwig Rütimeyer, who was a friend of Darwin, and who contributed to the spread of Darwinism in Germany. Zoologist Ernst Haeckel, an influential and well-known supporter of Darwinism in Germany, is another figure through which Nietzsche knew Darwinism. In Nietzsche’s library, there was Wilhelm Roux’s *The Struggle of the Parts in the Organism*, which, for Wolfgang Müller-Lauter, had considerable effects on the formation of Nietzsche’s understanding of the world as will to power.⁶⁸ Carl von Nägeli’s *A Mechanico-Physiological Theory of Organic Evolution* is another influential book on Nietzsche’s thought concerning Darwinism and evolution.⁶⁹ Paul Rée’s *The Origins of Moral Feelings*, in which he presents a natural history of morality, had great influence on Nietzsche’s interest in the origin of morality. There might be other names that should be listed here, but for the purpose of this work, the above mentioned names, should be sufficient.

⁶⁶ Ansell-Pearson, p. 87.

⁶⁷ For example, Grosz says that “[i]t seems quite clear from what Nietzsche does say about Darwin that he did not read Darwin’s own texts, but instead was familiar with some of Darwin’s sources (Malthus and Lamarck), with some of the writings of the English Darwinians (Herbert Spencer and T. E. Huxley), and with quite a number of German Darwinians (among them, Ernst Haeckel), with whom he quite justifiably disagreed.” (Grosz, p. 98.) According to Dennett, “Nietzsche’s references to Darwin also reveals that his acquaintance with Darwin’s ideas was beset with common misrepresentations and misunderstandings, so perhaps he ‘knew’ Darwin primarily through the enthusiastic appropriations of the many popularizers in Germany, and indeed throughout Europe. On the few points of specific criticism he ventures, he gets Darwin utterly wrong.” (Daniel Dennett, *Darwin’s Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meanings of Life*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996, p. 182.) For Brobjer, Nietzsche “always remained a somewhat superficial and amateur commentator. This was despite the fact he read a large number of books on the subject, including specialist biological treatises as well as works of popular science . . . and the fact that his best friend during his ‘middle period’, Paul Rée, was a firm supporter of Darwinism. Furthermore, unlike Rée, Nietzsche seems not to have read anything by Darwin himself.” (Brobjer, pp. 22-23.)

⁶⁸ See, Müller-Lauter, pp. 161-82.

⁶⁹ See, Ansell-Pearson, pp. 93-94.

As we have seen, there are two points on which commentators agree. First, they agree that Nietzsche's thought was somewhat influenced by the Darwinian evolutionary theory, and due to its complexity it is very difficult to determine its scope and the context in which it is most evident. Secondly, they agree that Nietzsche never read Darwin directly, and because of this he misunderstood Darwin, and used this misrepresentation of Darwin in his criticism. After presenting the views of the commentators about the relation between Nietzsche and Darwin and the influence of Darwinism on Nietzsche's thought, let us start to examine Darwin's theory of evolution.

Darwinism, briefly put, is a theory, which explains the development and the diversity of life forms in terms of evolutionary change. This evolutionary change, for Darwin, takes place through "natural selection" and "adaptation," which are the main principles of the Darwinian evolutionary theory. Darwinian evolutionary change has three basic assumptions: 1) there are individual differences, structural and behavioral, among the members of the same species in their adaptation to the environment; 2) these individual differences in adaptation are hereditary and it is conveyed to next generations by inheritance; 3) Malthusian law of population, according to which nature's capacity to supply food could not meet the organism's reproduction rate.⁷⁰ Therefore, there is a struggle for existence among the individuals. As Jonathan Howard claims, "the principle of natural selection is a deductive consequence of heritable variation, multiplication, and the struggle for survival."⁷¹ At the end of the process of natural selection, only the better adapted, or the better fitted, individuals will survive. Darwin describes natural selection as the following:

⁷⁰ For a detailed synopsis of the structure of Darwin's theory of evolution, see Peter J. Vorzimmer, *Charles Darwin: The Years of Controversy*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970, pp. 6-11. Thomas Malthus explains his law of population as the following: "Population, when unchecked, increases in a geometrical ratio. [i.e., 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, etc.] Subsistence increases only in an arithmetical ratio. [i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, etc.] . . . This implies a strong and constantly operating check on population from the difficulty of subsistence." (Thomas Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, ed. Geoffrey Gilbert, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 13.)

⁷¹ Jonathan Howard, *Darwin: A Very Short Introduction*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 26.

If under changing conditions of life organic beings present individual differences in almost every part of their structure, and this cannot be disputed; if there be, owing to their geometrical rate of increase, a severe struggle for life at some age, season or year, and this certainly cannot be disputed; then, considering the infinite complexity of the relations of all organic beings to each other and to their conditions of life, causing an infinite diversity in structure, constitution, and habits, to be advantageous to them, it would be a most extraordinary fact if no variations had ever occurred useful to each being's own welfare, in the same manner as so many variations have occurred useful to man. But if variations useful to any organic being ever do occur, assuredly individuals thus characterised will have the best chance of being preserved in the struggle for life; and from the strong principle of inheritance, these will tend to produce offspring similarly characterised. This principle of preservation, or the survival of the fittest, I have called natural selection.⁷²

Natural selection works in accordance with the principle of utility; for Darwin, natural selection works for the good of the organism; in this context, he describes the utilitarian doctrine as the view which claims that "every detail of structure has been produced for the good of its possessor."⁷³ That is, in the process of natural selection, useful and beneficial traits, organs and characteristics remain and develop further, while the useless and harmful ones diminish and become vestigial.

Natural selection will never produce in a being any structure more injurious than beneficial to that being, for natural selection acts solely by and for the good of each. No organ will be formed, as Paley has remarked, for the purpose of causing pain or for doing an injury to its possessor. If a fair balance be struck between the good and evil caused by each part, each will be found on the whole advantageous. After the lapse of time, under changing conditions of life, if any part comes to be injurious, it will be modified; or if it be not so, the being will become extinct as myriads have become extinct.⁷⁴

⁷² Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1947, p. 124.

⁷³ Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, p. 184.

⁷⁴ Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, p. 187.

Other than natural selection, in Darwin's theory, sexual selection is also operative in the process of evolution. While the deciding factor in the natural selection is struggle for existence, in sexual selection, it is the struggle for having the other sex for producing better fitted offspring. However, for Darwin, it is not as important as natural selection. In *The Origin of Species*, he writes

This form of selection depends, not on a struggle for existence in relation to other organic beings or to external conditions, but on a struggle between the individuals of one sex, generally the males, for the possession of the other sex. The result is not death to the unsuccessful competitor, but few or no offspring. Sexual selection is, therefore, less rigorous than natural selection. Generally, the most vigorous males, those which are best fitted for their places in nature, will leave most progeny.⁷⁵

In *Descent of Man*, comparing natural and sexual selection, Darwin says that “[s]exual selection depends on the success of certain individuals over others of the same sex, in relation to the propagation of the species; whilst natural selection depends on the success of both sexes, at all ages, in relation to the general conditions of life.”⁷⁶ According to him, sexual selection takes place in two forms: first one, intrasexual selection is the struggle among the members of the same sex whose population is greater than the other sex (this usually occurs in the male population and also known as the male to male competition); and the second one, intersexual selection is the struggle in which the members of one sex competes with each other to be chosen by the other sex (this, again, usually occurs between the males, they try to seduce the females, and also known as mate choice). As Darwin puts it

[t]he sexual struggle is of two kinds: in the one it is between the individuals of the same sex, generally the males, in order to drive away or kill their rivals, the females remaining passive; while in the other, the struggle is likewise between the individuals of the same sex, in order to excite or charm those of

⁷⁵ Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, p. 87.

⁷⁶ Darwin, *Descent of Man*, New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 2004, p. 558.

the opposite sex, generally the females, which no longer remain passive, but select the more agreeable partners.⁷⁷

After briefly presenting Darwinian theory of evolution, let us turn to Nietzsche's critique of Darwin. As I have noted, many of the commentators claim that Nietzsche got Darwin wrong. Well, then, "what is the image of Darwin in Nietzsche's thought?" or "which points of the theory were misunderstood by Nietzsche?" The answers of these questions will become clear in our discussion of Nietzsche's critique of Darwin and Darwinism.

Let us start with Nietzsche's general view about Darwin and his theory. First of all, for Nietzsche, Darwin is one of those "respectable but mediocre Englishmen,"⁷⁸ whose character is to work within the limits of the present situations of the facts and the tendency to equalize man. Other than Darwin, among these "mediocre Englishmen," Nietzsche enumerates John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer. The views of these men, in this context especially Darwin's, are for the minds and the ears of the mediocre men. Because, these Englishmen's working method does not involve creative and innovative philosophical insight. They try to understand the world and nature just in the same way as the common man. That is, "these uniquely English discourses function by the accumulation of tiny details, by servility to facts, political or empirical, that limits any possibilities of conceptual or philosophical innovation and creation."⁷⁹ For this reason, Darwinism is a theory that developed under the condition of distress. Because, this theory, Nietzsche says, puts the Spinozistic instinct of self-preservation⁸⁰, which belongs to the mediocre man, or the man of herd, as the guiding principle in life process. "It should be considered symptomatic when some philosophers . . . considered the instinct of self-

⁷⁷ Darwin, *Descent of Man*, p. 558.

⁷⁸ BGE, §253, p. 191.

⁷⁹ Grosz, p. 100.

⁸⁰ For Spinoza, desire for self-preservation is the basic derive of every being and it is the sole basis of the virtue. "The endeavor after self-preservation is the essence itself of a thing . . . The endeavor after self-preservation is the primary and only foundation of virtue." Benedict de Spinoza, *The Philosophy of Spinoza Selected from his Chief Works*, New York: Kessinger Publishing Company, 2004, p. 269.

preservation decisive and *had* to see it that way; for they were individuals in condition of distress.”⁸¹ Nietzsche believes that the natural sciences of his day were heavily influenced by this principle of Spinoza. Darwinism is the theory on which this influence, for Nietzsche, had considerable bad effects; “our natural sciences have become so thoroughly entangled in the Spinozistic dogma (most recently and worst of all, Darwinism with its incomprehensibly onesided doctrine of the ‘struggle for existence’).”⁸² Nietzsche claims that this influence of the Spinozistic dogma is related to the origins of natural scientists. That is, they are heavily influenced by this principle because “they belong to the ‘common people’; their ancestors were poor and undistinguished people who knew the difficulties of survival only too well at firsthand.”⁸³ Darwin, as one of these natural scientists, is a “spirit of low type.” Because, attaining knowledge is not sufficient for being a spirit of high type, it requires “to *be* something new, to *signify* something new, to *represent* new values.”⁸⁴ Darwin’s theory belongs to the type of “truths that are recognized best by mediocre minds because they are most congenial to them,”⁸⁵ because both Darwin and his theory lacks the requirements for being a spirit of high type. Finally, Nietzsche, in a way responding in advance to the interpreters who claim that Nietzsche did not have necessary knowledge in the field of biology or other sciences, or those who claim that Nietzsche did not read Darwin directly, writes that “those who can do things in the grand style, the creative, may possibly have to be lacking in knowledge—while, on the other hand, for scientific discoveries of the type of Darwin’s a certain narrowness, aridity, and industrious diligence, something English in short, may not be a bad disposition.”⁸⁶

According to Nietzsche, Darwin’s theory of evolution is a reactive theory. It designates a life, which is found on adaptive reactions of the organisms

⁸¹ GS, §349, p. 292.

⁸² GS, §349, p. 292.

⁸³ GS, §349, p. 292.

⁸⁴ BGE, §253, p. 191.

⁸⁵ BGE, §253, p. 191.

⁸⁶ BGE, §253, p. 191.

to the external forces. In the process of evolution, transformation of an organism takes place through the organism's adaptation to external conditions, or its reactions to the actions of external forces. Here, in the evolutionary process, the defining factor is the external forces, and the organism has no effect over the process; it has no chance other than obeying the demands of these external forces. According to Nietzsche, by overestimating the influences of external forces, Darwin ignores "the essential thing in the life process" which "is precisely the tremendous shaping, form-creating force working from within which utilizes and exploits 'external circumstances.'"⁸⁷ However, for Nietzsche, adaptation is "an activity of the second rank, a mere reactivity," which takes place after "the spontaneous, aggressive, expansive, form-giving,"⁸⁸ exerted their influence on the external forces. Therefore, adaptation cannot be the essence of life, and life cannot be defined in terms of it: "Life is not the adaptation of inner circumstances to outer ones, but will to power, which, working from within, incorporates and subdues more and more of that which is 'outside.'"⁸⁹

Moreover, for Nietzsche, the outcome of the process of natural selection, which takes place through adaptation and struggle for existence, is just the opposite of what Darwin expects. In other words, the evolutionary process results in not the survival of the strongest, fittest or the better adapted individuals, but the weak and the maladaptive ones. "What surprises me most . . . is that," says Nietzsche, "I always see before me the opposite of that which Darwin and his school see or *want* to see today," that is, "the elimination of the lucky strokes, the uselessness of the more highly developed types, the inevitable dominion of the average, even the *sub-average* types."⁹⁰

According to Nietzsche, the principle of "the struggle for existence" is not a general rule that guides life, but it is "an *exception*, a temporary restriction

⁸⁷ WP, §650, p. 344.

⁸⁸ GM, II §12, p. 79.

⁸⁹ WP, §681, p. 361.

⁹⁰ WP, §685, p. 364.

of will to life.”⁹¹ For Nietzsche, Darwin’s application of Malthusian law of population, leads him to misunderstand general condition of nature. Life, as this principle assumes, is not lack or scarcity, but wealth, riches and luxury; “One should not mistake Malthus for nature.”⁹² Nietzsche claims that if there is any struggle, then it is for power, not for survival. For him, to propose struggle for existence as the guiding principle in the process of evolution is “the symptom of a condition of distress,” and the “limitation of the really fundamental instinct of life which aims at *the expansion of power*.”⁹³ In its search for more power, this instinct when faced with a condition in which it must choose either self-preservation or more power, without hesitation chooses power. That is, for Nietzsche, it is the will to power, not the self-preservation, that is decisive in the life process. Self-preservation comes to the scene only after the will to power exerts its power; that is, it is only a side effect of the will to power:

Physiologists should think before putting down the instinct of preservation as the cardinal instinct of an organic being. A living thing seeks above all to *discharge* its strength—life itself is *will to power*; self-preservation is only one of the indirect and most frequent *results*.⁹⁴

However, when there is such a struggle for existence, it results in the triumph of the weak over the strong. As Nietzsche puts it, “the strongest and most fortunate are weak when opposed by organized herd instincts, by the timidity of the weak, by the vast majority,”⁹⁵ and “the weak prevail over the strong again and again, for they are the great majority—and they are also more *intelligent*.”⁹⁶ Nietzsche regards Darwin’s forgetting of the spirit (*Geist*) as the reason for this unwelcome result of the theory. “It will be noted that,” says Nietzsche, “by ‘spirit’ I mean care, patience, cunning, simulation, great self-

⁹¹ GS, §349, p. 292.

⁹² TI, “Skirmishes of an Untimely Man” §14, p. 522.

⁹³ GS, §349, p. 291.

⁹⁴ BGE, §13, p. 21. (WP, §650, p. 344.)

⁹⁵ WP, §685, p. 364.

⁹⁶ TI, “Skirmishes of an Untimely Man” §14, p. 523.

control, and everything that is mimicry (the latter includes a great deal of so-called virtue).”⁹⁷ This spirit, as Nietzsche’s explanation implies, is morality. In *Daybreak*, Nietzsche, draws parallels between the adaptive behaviors of the animals and man, and claims that “entire phenomenon of morality” is nothing more than a tool in the service of self preservation. In this context, for Nietzsche, mimicry has a special role. As animals adapt themselves envrioning conditions by mimicry, i.e., changing their colors to hide from their enemies or their prey, “the individual hides himself in the general concept ‘man’ or in society, or adapts himself to princes, classes, parties, opinions of his time and place: and all the subtle ways we have of appearing fortunate, grateful, powerful, enamoured.”⁹⁸ As an adaptive trait contributing to the struggle for existence, morality belongs to the weak and the mediocre ones; hence, they cling to it. However, strong ones, lusting for more power, dispense with spirit, or morality. As Nietzsche says “*the weak have more spirit*. One must need spirit to acquire spirit; one loses it when one no longer needs it. Whoever has strength dispenses with the spirit.”⁹⁹ Through this morality or spirit, the weak and the mediocre type dominate society.

In a note entitled “Why the weak conquer,” Nietzsche explains how the weak have dominated the society. There, he emphasizes four major components of the process in which the weak dominates through their spirit. These are the weak and the sick, women, increasing civilization and the French Revolution. Because of their lack of power and illness, the weak and the sick have more sympathy with others and behave in a way that is more humane than the stronger and the healthy. Moreover, they have more spirit, which means, as mentioned earlier, “care, patience, cunning, simulation, great self-control, and everything that is mimicry.” This spirit makes them more “changeable,” “entertaining,” “interesting” and “fascinating,” than the stronger and the healthy. However, for Nietzsche, at the same time, they are more “malicious,” and invented “malice.”

⁹⁷ TI, “Skirmishes of an Untimely Man” §14, p. 523.

⁹⁸ D, §26, p. 20-21.

⁹⁹ TI, “Skirmishes of an Untimely Man” §14, p. 523.

Actually, the healthy and the strong are also sick at some periods in their lives; “the great emotions, the passions of power, love, revenge, are accompanied by profound disturbances.”¹⁰⁰ Thus, they know the feelings belonging to sickness and weakness firsthand. As for the woman, Nietzsche says “[o]ne-half of mankind is weak, typically sick, changeable, inconstant.”¹⁰¹ Being essentially weak, women try to make the strong weak or to find ways of glorifying and sanctifying being weak and ill. To make the strong weak, Nietzsche says, “[w]oman has always conspired with the types of decadence, the priests, against the ‘powerful,’ the ‘strong,’ the men,”¹⁰² and when she succeeds she rules the strong. Increasing civilization is another factor in the conquest of the weak. The increase of the civilization is accompanied by “an increase in the morbid elements, in the neurotic-psychiatric and criminal.”¹⁰³ According to Nietzsche, these morbid elements are artists as an intermediary species. These artists, again, because of their weakness, are between criminals and lunatics. They have “restrained from *crime* by weakness of will and social timidity, and not yet ripe for the *madhouse*.”¹⁰⁴ These artists describe their mode of living as “naturalism,” which is an inappropriate word for Nietzsche. According to him, the increase in the number of such artists and naturalists is the sign of rapid growth of the civilization, which implies that “the decline keeps pace.”¹⁰⁵ The final step, the French Revolution, by its demand for the equality of rights among man creates “a social hodgepodge.” The result of this social hodgepodge is the mixing of the bloods of all classes, whose result is that “two, three generations later the race is no longer recognizable—everything has become mob.”¹⁰⁶ In the resulting society, there appears a hatred to the selected, to the privileged. This hatred is so powerful that the privileged succumbs to it, and to preserve his power, the

¹⁰⁰ WP, §964, p. 460.

¹⁰¹ WP, §964, p. 460.

¹⁰² WP, §964, p. 460.

¹⁰³ WP, §964, p. 460.

¹⁰⁴ WP, §964, p. 460.

¹⁰⁵ WP, §964, p. 460.

¹⁰⁶ WP, §964, p. 461.

privileged flatters it. This relation with the privileged and the mob is mutual; that is, while the mob helps the privileged in retaining his power, the privileged helps the mob by providing the required discourses for moving the masses. The privileged, “the ‘geniuses’ above all,” says Nietzsche, “become heralds of those feelings with which one moves the masses—the note of sympathy, even reverence, for all that has lived a life of suffering, lowliness, contempt, persecution, sounds above all other notes (types: Victor Hugo and Richard Wagner).”¹⁰⁷ As a result of this movement, the mob and the privileged dominate the society. According to Nietzsche, when civilizations experience such an extreme change, men’s center of gravity changes, or rather slides from “*those* men who matter most, who have, as it were, the task of compensating for the vast danger of such a morbid movement” to the mediocre, who, against this dominion, “consolidates . . . [himself] as the guarantee and bearer of the future.”¹⁰⁸ Hence, by not adapting themselves to the mob and flattering the instincts of the “disinherited,” the mediocre becomes prevalent in the society. Through this dominion of the mediocrity, for Nietzsche, “once more the old virtue,” *aurea mediocritas*,* “and the entire dated world of the ideal in general, gains a body of gifted advocates”; hence “mediocrity acquires spirit.”¹⁰⁹

For Nietzsche, as a man of herd and a mediocre and weak man, Darwin translates reality into morality. That is, Darwin, showing that morality is also a product of evolution, tries to naturalize morality. However, for Nietzsche, this means nothing more than to consecrate the present values in the society, with which Nietzsche occupies himself. Because of this translation, in the world of values, or society as a whole, the mediocre, the weak, and the decadents are regarded as more valuable than the strongest and the highest ones. Nietzsche rebels against this translation on the ground that “it created sublime words and gestures to throw over a horrible reality the cloak of justice, virtue, and

¹⁰⁷ WP, §964, p. 461.

¹⁰⁸ WP, §964, p. 461.

* Golden rule, Horace, *Odes* II. x. 5.

¹⁰⁹ WP, §964, p. 461.

divinity.”¹¹⁰ In *Descent of Man*, where Darwin tries to account for the origin of morality by applying his notion of evolution, there are expressions that suggest that Darwin makes such a translation; that is, he translates reality into morality.

Darwin’s argument for the origin of morality depends on his conviction that morality is evolved from the social qualities acquired through natural selection. He names some of the basic social qualities as sympathy, courage, and fidelity, and adds that these qualities “were no doubt acquired by progenitors of man in a similar manner, namely, through natural selection, aided by inherited habit.”¹¹¹ Living as a society, or to become social, for Darwin, is the precondition of morality. The mechanism or the instinct that compels man to become social is the same as that compels other organisms. That is, the determining factor in the development of social instincts, as in the case of animal instincts, is their value for the survival. “In order that primeval men, or the ape-like men, should have become social,” says Darwin, “they must have acquired the same instinctive feelings, which impel other animals to live in a body.”¹¹² Social instincts, at the base of which there lie parental and filial affections, are the key factors in the development of social life. For Darwin, social instincts are developed through parental and filial affections: “. . . the social instinct seems to be developed by the young remaining for a long time with their parents.”¹¹³ Hence, social life and taking pleasure from it are the extensions of the parental and filial affections. This extension of parental and filial affections to the pleasure of living in a society, for Darwin, although there is an effect of habit, is mainly attributable to natural selection. Because, living as a society increases the chance of survival. Darwin supports this claim by an example from bee community; queen-bees kill their daughter-queens for it contributes to the survival of the community. Thus, Darwin concludes that social instincts are prior to living in a society; firstly, the social instincts develop, then animals,

¹¹⁰ WP, §685, p. 364.

¹¹¹ Darwin, *Descent of Man*, p. 155.

¹¹² Darwin, *Descent of Man*, p. 155.

¹¹³ Darwin, *Descent of Man*, p. 87.

appreciating its value for the survival, start to live as communities. This is why Darwin puts development of the social instincts at the basis of morality.

Darwin summarizes the development of morality in four stages. At the first step, social instincts, which are innate propensities, “lead an animal to take pleasure in the society of its fellows, to feel a certain amount of sympathy with them, and to perform various services for them.”¹¹⁴ Secondly, after the development of the mental faculties into a high level, “images of the past actions and motives would be incessantly passing through the brain of each individual.”¹¹⁵ Throughout its life every animal somehow feels dissatisfaction or sorrow from “any unsatisfied instinct,” and, because the social instincts are more basic and stronger than the later developed ones, feelings of dissatisfactions resulting from them lasts more than the others do. As a result, the animal’s ability of sympathy for others’ feelings become stronger. Whenever the later developed instincts and the social instincts are in conflict, if the individual follows other instincts instead of social ones it will feel embarrassment. This feeling of embarrassment lasts longer than the dissatisfactions resulting from not following the other ones, and as Darwin emphasizes it always haunts. At the third level, Darwin mentions the ever-growing intensity of the ability of sympathy by the acquirement of language. Through language, “the wishes of the community could be expressed, the common opinion how each member ought to act for the public good, would naturally become in a paramount degree the guide to action.”¹¹⁶ Lastly, social instincts further strengthened by habit, and at the end become “obedience to the wishes and judgment of community.”¹¹⁷ In short, “the social instincts – the prime principle of man’s moral constitution – with the aid of active intellectual powers and the effects of habit, naturally lead to the golden

¹¹⁴ Darwin, *Descent of Man*, p. 121.

¹¹⁵ Darwin, *Descent of Man*, p. 121.

¹¹⁶ Darwin, *Descent of Man*, p. 122.

¹¹⁷ Darwin, *Descent of Man*, p. 122.

rule, 'As ye would that men should do to you, do ye to them likewise;' and this lies at the foundation of morality."¹¹⁸

The privileged subject of Darwin's morality is the society, herd, tribe, or more generally the species. The survival of the tribe is more valuable than that of the individual, and to this end strong or "well-endowed" individuals should sacrifice themselves. Well-endowed individuals, for Darwin, are those members of the tribe "who, from possessing in a high degree the spirit of patriotism, fidelity, obedience, courage, and sympathy, were always ready to aid one another, and to sacrifice themselves for the common good."¹¹⁹ An increase in the number of the well-endowed individuals as well as in the moral standards of the tribe increases the survival chance of a tribe. A tribe, or society, with a high number of such well-endowed individuals and high standards of morality, for Darwin, "would be victorious over most other tribes; and this would be natural selection."¹²⁰

This explanation of the origin of morality in terms of natural selection, for Nietzsche, is nothing more than imposing morality upon nature, nothing more than translating reality into morality. Darwin denies his principle of the survival of the fittest in the realm of culture or morality. In other words, in the realm of nature, Darwin claims that the strongest and fittest individuals survive, whereas, in the realm of culture, it is the weak and mediocre ones that survive. For Nietzsche, this is a big contradiction and Darwin commits the "basic errors of the biologists hitherto: it is not the question of species but of the powerful individuals. (The many are only a means)."¹²¹ Moreover, this explanation of Darwin, for Nietzsche, means altruism and therefore it is complete denial of the will to power, which is the will to life. If Darwinian "social instincts" (e.g., sympathy, parental and filial affection) prevail in the society and are accepted "as the *fundamental principle of society*, it immediately proves to be what it

¹¹⁸ Darwin, *Descent of Man*, p. 151.

¹¹⁹ Darwin, *Descent of Man*, p. 157.

¹²⁰ Darwin, *Descent of Man*, p. 157-58.

¹²¹ WP, §681, p. 360-61.

really is—a will to the *denial* of life, a principle of disintegration and decay.”¹²² According to Nietzsche, if there is a living body there is also “appropriation, injury, overpowering of what is alien and weaker; suppression, hardness, imposition of one’s own forms, incorporation and at least, at its mildest, exploitation.”¹²³ For Nietzsche, Darwin, ignoring this fundamental biological fact, proposes a morality, which is “against the efforts of nature to achieve a higher type.”¹²⁴

According to Nietzsche, there is an implicit teleology in Darwin’s theory. Especially, for Nietzsche, the principle of struggle for existence is a teleological principle. “[L]et us beware of *superfluous* teleological principles” says Nietzsche, “one of which is the instinct of self-preservation.”¹²⁵ Darwinian natural selection proceeds through the blind forces of nature; there is no designer behind the process of evolution. Traits are gained by blind chance, and if they are useful to individuals or organisms in their struggle for survival, they are preserved and further developed. That is, the decisive factor in an organism’s having a trait or an organ is its utility in the organism’s struggle for existence. For André Ariew, this kind of explanation is a functional teleological explanation in the Aristotelian sense: “What makes a trait *useful* is that it provides certain individuals an advantage over others in their own struggle to survive and reproduce.”¹²⁶ However, Ariew mentions two differences between teleologies of Aristotle and Darwin. The first difference is that, for Darwin, traits occur by chance whereas, for Aristotle, they occur for the benefit of the organism’s survival. The second difference is that, for Aristotle, usefulness is the determining factor in the origin of organs whereas, for Darwin, it is the available traits. In other words, for Aristotle, “an item’s usefulness *constrains* the

¹²² BGE, §259, p. 203.

¹²³ BGE, §259, p. 203.

¹²⁴ WP, §400, p. 216.

¹²⁵ BGE, §13, p. 21. (WP, §650, p. 344.)

¹²⁶ André Ariew, “Platonic and Aristotelian Roots of Teleological Arguments,” in eds. Andre Ariew, Robert Cummins, and Mark Perlman, *Functions : New Essays in the Philosophy of Psychology and Biology*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002, (pp.7-32), p. 28.

necessity of the materials. That is, *because* eyes are useful for seeing, the organic ingredients coalesce,” whereas, for Darwin, “this is exactly backwards: the materials constrain function. Natural selection operates on the materials (the variants) that are available to it.”¹²⁷ In spite of these differences, it seems that the usefulness in the struggle for existence is what makes Darwin’s theory teleological.

Nietzsche rejects the idea that struggle for existence is the determining factor in the formation or development of the organs. As we know, for Nietzsche, it is the struggle for power that is decisive in the life process. Hence, it is the will to power that causes the formation of organs. According to Nietzsche, will to power actively interprets the world, or life conditions, to gain more power. “In fact, interpretation is itself is a means of becoming master of something.”¹²⁸ In the organic world, the process of interpretation constantly occurs, and “it is a question of interpretation when an organ is constructed.”¹²⁹

The origin of an organ cannot be explained by its utility for the preservation of the organism. For Nietzsche, just the opposite is the case; “most of the time during which a property is forming it does not preserve the individual and is no use to him, least of all in the struggle with external circumstances and enemies.”¹³⁰ For example, something useful for the preservation of the organism, at the same time, may cause loss of strength, or may interfere with the evolution of the organism. The idea behind this claim of Nietzsche is his belief that the life is “a multiplicity of forces, connected by a common mode of nutrition,”¹³¹ and his description of the individual as “a struggle between parts (for food, space, etc.): its evolution tied to the victory or predominance of the individual parts, to an atrophy, a ‘becoming an organ’ of the other parts.”¹³² This common mode of nutrition includes feelings, thoughts, ideas; in short, what makes such a nutrition

¹²⁷ Ariew, p. 29.

¹²⁸ WP, §643, p. 342.

¹²⁹ WP, §643, p. 342.

¹³⁰ WP, §647, p. 343.

¹³¹ WP, §641, p. 341.

¹³² WP, §647, p. 344.

possible; such as, “(1) a resistance to all other forces; (2) an adjustment of the same according to form and rhythm; (3) an estimate in regard to assimilation or excretion.”¹³³ Because of this structure of the individual or organism, the utility of an organ or a part in its preservation, or in its struggle with the external conditions, may result in the corruption of the evolution of the organism. The only thing that drives evolution is the inner struggle of the individual parts of the organism with each other. If preservation is placed in the foreground, the emphasis is directed towards adaptation to the external circumstances, in which case the organism becomes a reactive being. This means that it is not the active and creative forces, but the reactive ones that are prevalent in the organism. These reactive forces, or, as a whole, the reactive organism, cannot be the stimulant of evolution. As Nietzsche puts it, “there must be present something that wants to grow and interprets the value whatever what wants to grow,”¹³⁴ and this something is will to power, which is “the really fundamental instinct of life which aims at *the expansion of power* and, wishing for that, frequently risks and even sacrifices self-preservation.”¹³⁵

Moreover, for Nietzsche, whatever may be the cause of the formation of an organ, it is radically different from its utility. That is, “the cause of the origin of a thing and its eventual utility, its actual employment and place in a system of purposes, lie world apart.”¹³⁶ Because, the world is will to power, and there is an active power struggle among power centers. In this power struggle, every power center constantly interprets, and is interpreted by, the other power centers. Hence, the utility or meaning of a power center would be in a constant change according to the perspective of the ever-changing power center. “Whatever exists, having come into being,” says Nietzsche, “is again and again reinterpreted to new ends, taken over, transformed, and redirected by some power superior to

¹³³ WP, §641, p. 342.

¹³⁴ WP, §643, p. 342.

¹³⁵ GS, §349, p. 291-92.

¹³⁶ GM, II §12, p. 77.

it.”¹³⁷ Because of the struggle for ever-more power in the organic world, Nietzsche claims, “all events in the organic world are a subduing, a *becoming master*,” and this process “involves a fresh interpretation, an adaptation through which any previous ‘meaning’ and ‘purpose’ are necessarily obscured or even obliterated.”¹³⁸ Additionally, for Nietzsche, “purposes and utilities are only *signs* that a will to power has become master of something less powerful and imposed upon the character of a function.”¹³⁹ Therefore, the origin of an organ is not explainable by applying neither its utility nor its purpose. Consequently, Darwin’s introduction of the struggle for existence into the evolution as the principle of life process is nothing more than imposing a “*superfluous teleological principle*” upon the active, shaping, form giving, inner force, namely, the will to power.

However, a teleology is also attributed to Nietzsche’s doctrine of the will to power. Peter Poellner takes the will to power as a ‘teleological principle of explanation.’¹⁴⁰ He claims that “[t]he nature of human activity, including the activity of cognition—or, as he [Nietzsche] prefers to say, of interpretation—is explained in terms of a teleological principle: the will to power.”¹⁴¹ According to him, will to power as a teleological principle of explanation is neither a *telos* to which all change is directed, nor a directness or disposition to a metaphysical or natural end. Rather, it is “a type of explanation of events in terms of ‘*the goal or result aimed at “for the sake” of which the event is said to occur*’, in contradistinction to the ordinary causal kind of explanation in terms of

¹³⁷ GM, II §12, p. 77.

¹³⁸ GM, II §12, p. 77.

¹³⁹ GM, II §12, p. 77.

¹⁴⁰ In a different context, Danto presents Nietzsche’s will to power as an explanatory principle. According to Danto, Nietzsche’s program was to reduce all phenomena to a single principle. Danto names this program as “Methodological Monism.” (See, note 38.) In connection with the difference between the physical and organic process, Danto maintains that, for Nietzsche, there is no difference between these processes and “[i]t was the function of Will-to-Power to close the gap and to provide an ultimate explanatory principle for whatever there might be.” (Danto, *Nietzsche*, p. 199.)

¹⁴¹ Peter Poellner, *Nietzsche and Metaphysics*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1995, p. 165.

‘(logically) *unconnected antecedent conditions*.’”¹⁴² According to Poellner, Nietzsche characterizes human nature as a striving for power. Because of this nature, all of the activities of an individual human being are directed to the feeling of increase of power. Nietzsche uses his doctrine of will to power to account for this nature of human beings. For Poellner, Nietzsche’s use of will to power shows us “that he resorts to a kind of explanation by purpose, that is, one which appeals to some moving force which is to some degree analogous to that which we ordinarily consider to be efficacious in intentional, volitional activity.”¹⁴³ Poellner tries to show this analogy by analyzing the relation between the exertion of power and purpose. Poellner claims that, in situations, in which there is no purpose or intention, we cannot speak of the exertion of power. In other words, an individual increases his power by exerting his power over other individuals or nature, yet, if, somehow, individual’s capability of pursuing a purposeful activity is hindered, then there occurs no exertion of power. “If neither the ‘agent’ nor the ‘patient’ in a given situation is in principle capable of purposeful activity, then this not a situation in which *Macht* [power] is either exerted or suffered.”¹⁴⁴ Poellner asserts that if we still insist on the claim that there occurs exertion of power without any agent capable of purposeful activity, then we necessarily speak in an anthropomorphizing manner; “[w]e do *not* speak—except in an anthropomorphizing metaphor—of a mountain exerting power over a river by standing in its way and diverting it.”¹⁴⁵ Thus, for Poellner, there must be an agent with its capability for purposeful action if one may speak of a power exertion without falling into anthropomorphism. Poellner tries to show that there is such agency in the doctrine of will to power.

Poellner starts to analyze what Nietzsche means by exertion of power. According to Poellner, Nietzsche understands exertion of power mainly as

¹⁴² Poellner, p. 165; italics are mine. Poellner takes this definition from Charles Taylor, and the italicized phrases in the quotation are quoted by Poellner from Charles Taylor, *The Explanation of Behaviour*, London: Daedalus Books, 1964, p. 5-6.

¹⁴³ Poellner, p. 165.

¹⁴⁴ Poellner, p. 166.

¹⁴⁵ Poellner, p. 166.

“appropriation,” “assimilation,” “shaping,” and “overwhelming.” However, Poellner warns us that we would misunderstand Nietzsche, if we ignore the generality of these terms. Poellner says that the term “shaping,” for Nietzsche, not only means a shaping activity of an artist or a craftsman, but also to that of, for example, a teacher’s “shaping” the minds of students, etc. In addition, Poellner emphasizes Nietzsche’s use of “grasping” and “comprehension” as instances of “appropriation.” He continues his discussion about teleology of will to power, by saying that all these ways of exerting power “involves the recognition of a ‘difference’ which ‘presuppos[es] a comparison’ . . . by the agent between the state of an object or opponent before the agent has acted on it and after, or during, his activity.”¹⁴⁶ Here, Poellner seems to claim that there is a series of cognitive states in which the agent is aware of its opponent and the courses of its struggle with that opponent. This requires, as Poellner avers, both awareness of the processes in which exertion of power occurs and the awareness of “self” and “other.” However, the self-awareness, which appears in the process of power exertion, does not mean that Nietzsche has a traditional concept of self-awareness. “[T]he self-awareness involved in the experience Nietzsche calls the feeling of power,” says Poellner, “is different from introspection, for attention is focused here on the *object* of the activity,” and “the ‘self’ at issue (the ‘encroaching unit’)” is not “the mental substance of the philosophical tradition.”¹⁴⁷ Nietzsche, already, opposes traditional view of self by claiming the phenomenality of self: “I maintain the phenomenality of the inner world, too. Everything of which we become conscious is arranged, simplified, schematized, interpreted . . . The ‘apparent *inner* world’ is governed by just the same forms and procedures as the ‘outer’ world.”¹⁴⁸ For Poellner, the teleological principle of explanation, together with Nietzsche’s “phenomenal self” postulation, explains his notion of truth, too, without postulating any metaphysical or Cartesian self as the criterion of truth. That is, we perceive our selves as we

¹⁴⁶ Poellner, p. 167.

¹⁴⁷ Poellner, p. 168.

¹⁴⁸ WP, §477, p. 263-64.

perceive other organisms and the entities in the phenomenal world; we have no privileged access to our self. Hence, we interpret our feelings, desires, etc., as we interpret the entities in the outer world. As we know, Nietzsche's criterion for truth is the enhancement of feeling of power. To say that any idea, belief, etc. is true means that it enhances the power, or feeling of power, of the agent who makes this judgment. Poellner says that, for Nietzsche, truth, as well as the feeling of power, is relative.¹⁴⁹ This relativity, for Poellner, implies that the agent is aware of "a difference between two or more successive states" and this difference "can only be realized and maintained if the power of the individual is continually increased, that is, if the process—as it appears to the agent—of overcoming resistances, of exerting power, does not cease."¹⁵⁰

Consequently, what we learn from Poellner's analysis of the will to power, as a teleological principle of explanation, could be summarized as the follows. Nietzsche characterizes human nature as striving for power; that is, every human being tries to increase his power or his feeling of power. Power increase requires exertion of power over other human beings or nature, yet, without purpose, we cannot speak of exertion of power. Therefore, there must be an agent capable of pursuing purposeful activities if there is an exertion of power in any event. Exertion of power requires also a capability to compare and evaluate the opponent. This means that the agent, who exerts power, should have an awareness of self and other. However, this self-awareness is a phenomenological one; here neither the self is a mental substance nor awareness is introspection. This notion of phenomenal self enables Nietzsche to assert a truth criterion that is not rooted in a metaphysical or Cartesian self. That criterion is the enhancement of the feeling of power. For Poellner, all of the activities of human beings, including cognitive ones, thus, explained by Nietzsche in terms of the goal of increasing the feeling of power, or in terms of the will to power.

However, I think, Poellner misses some of the crucial points in Nietzsche's characterization of will to power. Firstly, Nietzsche's doctrine of the

¹⁴⁹ See, Chapter 3.4, for a discussion of relativism.

¹⁵⁰ Poellner, p. 168.

will to power does not aim mainly at explaining human activities, whether it is physiological or cognitive. The scope of this doctrine is not limited to organic life, either. As we have seen, Nietzsche does not agree with the traditional distinction between organic and inorganic entities. Because he views the world as the world of becoming, there is no inorganic entity as something dead, in this world; “‘Being’—we have no other idea of this than ‘*living*’. How, then, something dead ‘be.’”¹⁵¹ Therefore, Poellner’s explanation does not work in the realm of those matters, which we regard as inorganic. Nietzsche clearly express his view about extending will to power doctrine to those apparently inorganic entities:

The will to accumulate force is special to the phenomena of life, to nourishment, procreation, inheritance—to society, state, custom, authority. Should we not be permitted to assume this will as a motive cause in chemistry, too?—and in the cosmic order?¹⁵²

Moreover, Poellner’s discussion of the relation between exertion of power and the capability of purposeful activity seems to commit a fatal misunderstanding of will to power. Nietzsche does not contemplate will to power as an attribution of the power quanta. In other words, there is not a separate entity, or power center, on which the will to power is attributed, because that entity is just will to power. Let us remember that Nietzsche is against the distinction between the doer and the deed; a thing, an entity, is what it does; it is the totality of its effects on other and the effects of the other on it. Furthermore, for Nietzsche, there is no inactive thing, everything is in motion; that is, everything is always in a struggle for power with every other thing. Therefore, everything continuously exerts power over other things. In this sense, we can say that, for Nietzsche, the world is power exertion and nothing else; “every power draws its ultimate consequence at every moment.”¹⁵³ Therefore, Poellner’s belief that without purpose we cannot speak of any power exertion is senseless.

¹⁵¹ WLN, 2[172], p. 94.

¹⁵² WP, §689, p. 367.

¹⁵³ WP, §634, p. 337.

Finally, Poellner's claim that will to power is a teleological principle of explanation is not a fair charge for the doctrine of the will to power. Because, if we take such an accusation of teleology as plausible or correct, then we can charge every explanation as being a teleological principle of explanation. Every explanation, in a way, already aims at explaining a process, a course of action, an event or whatever else by showing the way that it follows through its occurrence. That is, an explanation is an expression or a description of the life of a process in which an event takes place; it, formally, starts from the beginning of an action and finishes with the end of that action. There may not be even necessary causal relations between the phases of the process; whole course of action could result from wholly chance or accident. However, we still claim that the end of the process or action, which we use in our explanation of the action, is a teleological principle of explanation. Therefore, the charge of being a teleological principle of explanation is not a fair charge.

As we have seen through Nietzsche's attacks, he and Darwin share much in the sense that they both have a theory for explaining life. They seem to agree on some general points; both believe in evolution, or mutation, of the organic forms; they both have an evolutionary concept of morality free of God or a transcendental realm as its origin; they both have a concept of struggle, or competition, in the organic world, etc. However, their way of explaining the phenomenon radically differs from each other. While Darwin tries to explain the evolutionary character of organisms by adaptation and struggle for existence, Nietzsche explains it by will to power and struggle for power. Darwin's explanations lead to a conception of an organic world, in which the individual organisms or groups of individuals try to adapt themselves to the envioning conditions for their survival. Because of this adaptive trait attributed to organisms and presentation of survival as the end of organic life, Nietzsche accuses Darwin's theory as a reactive theory. On the other hand, Nietzsche conceives of a world of active and dynamic power quanta, which struggle for increasing their power at the expense of their survival. Although, in a way, both Nietzsche and Darwin try to explain the same phenomenon without appealing to

any transcending being or realm, they reach to two radically different theories of evolution. Therefore, looking at the general similarities between Darwin's and Nietzsche's thoughts, which results from engaging with the same phenomenon, namely life, it is not fair to conclude that Nietzsche is a Darwinist thinker.

Differences between their explanations of the phenomenon of life, as we have seen, show itself clearly in Nietzsche's attacks on Darwin's explanation of the origin and the evolution of morality in human beings. Darwin's view on morality is a completely altruistic one, because it is based on the struggle for survival. Nietzsche names this as *the ascetic ideal*, and says that

[T]he ascetic ideal springs from the protective instinct of a degenerating life which tries by all means to sustain itself and to fight for its existence; it indicates a partial physiological obstruction and exhaustion against which the deepest instinct of life, which have remained intact, continually struggle with new expedients and devices. The ascetic ideal is such an expedient; the case is therefore the opposite of those who reverence this ideal believe: life wrestles in it and through it with death and *against* death; the ascetic ideal is an artifice for the *preservation* of life.¹⁵⁴

Hence, for Nietzsche, a morality based on the instinct of self-preservation is inimical to life. If the preservation instinct is taken to be the principle of life, then life, which wants to become more and stronger, will be castrated and lose its creative and form giving force. Yet, preservation is only a byproduct of the will to power: "A living thing wants above all to *discharge* its force: 'preservation' is only a consequence of this."¹⁵⁵ Therefore, the instinct of self-preservation could not be the key principle for explaining neither organic life nor origin of morality.

Moreover, Nietzsche's concept of will to power could not be taken as a Darwinian principle. Because, as we have just seen, the will to power is stronger than the Darwinian instinct of self-preservation. However, this does not mean that Nietzsche ignores self-preservation; it is included in the concept of the will to power, yet only as a side-effect of it. That is, a quantum of force seeks to

¹⁵⁴ GM, III, §13, p. 120.

¹⁵⁵ WP, §650, p. 344.

increase its power, and, through this increase, it also preserves itself. As a power quantum is essentially will to power, when the struggle requires, it does not hesitate to risk its preservation.

Other than these differences, there is the problem of teleology that is attributed to both thinkers. Darwin eliminated the metaphysical teleology by eliminating the notion of a world of God and nature's inherent teleology with his theory of evolution, which explains the phenomenon of life and its evolution without appealing to any teleological sources. However, this elimination of teleology is only apparent, because his very theory of evolution is based on another teleology. In other words, his explanation of the evolution of organisms through adaptation and natural selection carries a hidden teleology; the teleology of survival. His explanations of all morphological transformations and developments, and, of course, adaptation are guided by the survival of the organisms. If any change occurs in the morphological structure of the organism, or if any new organs develop, this occurs for the sake of its utility in the preservation of the organism. Hence, Darwin's elimination of teleology is nothing but a change of the source of the teleology. As discussed above, Nietzsche opposes this teleology on the grounds that utility in the struggle for preservation cannot be the dynamic of the organic process.

I will conclude this section by drawing some conclusions from the above presented discussions. The similarity between Nietzsche's philosophy and Darwinism is only an apparent one. Their similarity comes mostly from the fact that they try to explain the same phenomenon, namely life, with an evolutionary approach. There is a fundamental difference between these thinkers; Darwin's concern is limited to organic life whereas Nietzsche's concern is the world, including organic and inorganic realms. Their approaches to the phenomenon are almost directly opposite; while Darwin pictures a life that is essentially passive, or reactive, Nietzsche pictures a life that is wholly active and dynamic. In that sense, Darwin's theory seems to imply a passive adaptation process while Nietzsche presents an active and shaping process to us. While Darwin puts the instinct of self-preservation as the principle of the evolution, Nietzsche puts the

power struggle and the dynamic form giving, shaping force, the will to power as the dynamic of the morphological change. Furthermore, Darwin's theory seems to be a teleological explanation of life whereas Nietzsche opposes teleology and presents a non-teleological doctrine about life and the world. Another fundamental difference between Darwin and Nietzsche concerns their views about the origin and the development of morality. Darwin bases morality on the social instincts attained through natural selection. As a product of natural selection, Darwinian morality aims at preservation of society, groups of individuals, or species. However, this morality, as Nietzsche notes, results in the opposite of what Darwin's theory of evolution expects; that is, not the fittest or better adapted individuals but the least adapted and weak ones survives through this morality. Nietzsche rejects such a morality as being altruistic, and harshly criticizes this altruistic morality. These differences between the thoughts of Darwin and Nietzsche, in my opinion, are so fundamental and so irreconcilable that it is impossible to claim that Nietzsche is a Darwinian thinker or that the will to power is a Darwinian principle.

2.4 Discussions Concerning the Metaphysical Character of the Will to Power

As we have seen in the preceding section, will to power is Nietzsche's answer to the question "What is there?" Although it is evident that it is not a kind of principle as that of traditional metaphysics, there are commentators who claim that it is metaphysical. The most important of those commentators is Heidegger. He claims not only that it is a metaphysical principle, but also that with this metaphysical principle, Nietzsche's philosophy is the consummation of Western metaphysics. In his *Nietzsche*, Heidegger writes,

In the thought of will to power, Nietzsche anticipates the metaphysical ground of the consummation of the modern age. In the thought of will to power, metaphysical thinking itself completes itself in advance. Nietzsche, the thinker of the

thought of will to power, is the *last metaphysician* of the West.¹⁵⁶

Heidegger's interpretation of Nietzsche's philosophy and his doctrine of the will to power were very influential on Nietzsche interpreters and the interpretations between the early 1960's and 1970's.¹⁵⁷ His influence, in my opinion, comes from several factors, which makes Heidegger an influential Nietzsche interpreter when joined together with his philosophical deepness. Firstly, he is a German and knows the German culture, language, philosophy, art and tradition directly, which enables him to access to the poetic and aphoristic language of Nietzsche and the issues with which Nietzsche is engaged. Secondly, both Nietzsche and Heidegger belong to the continental philosophy tradition; this is another advantage for Heidegger to understand Nietzsche's philosophy. Belonging to the same tradition enables Heidegger to grasp Nietzschean concepts more adequately and to penetrate the issues handled by Nietzsche more easily. And, maybe it is because of the influence of Nietzsche over him, Heidegger's use of language often very similar to that of Nietzsche. This similarity in the use of language, for me, shows his success in understanding Nietzsche's thought. In other words, this similarity means that Heidegger is well aware of the fact that Nietzsche finds the traditional, or ordinary, language, as an inadequate way of expressing his thoughts, and he uses this language by deforming it. However, Heidegger's access to Nietzsche's language does not mean that in his lectures, or in his writings on Nietzsche, he correctly represents Nietzsche's thoughts. In spite of Nietzsche's plain denial of metaphysics, Heidegger's accusation of him for doing metaphysics and his claim that Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power is a metaphysical doctrine support my claim. I think that all of Heidegger's writings and lectures on Nietzsche could be evaluated as, in Nietzsche's sense of the word, interpretations; they are just interpretations and nothing else. However, then, it becomes problematic to claim

¹⁵⁶ Martin Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, trans. by David Farrell Krell, San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991, vol. III, p. 8.

¹⁵⁷ Heidegger's Nietzsche lectures, although they were given in 1930's and early 1940's, were published as four volumes in 1961, under the title of *Nietzsche*.

that these works are about Nietzsche; that is, the thoughts reconstructed in Heidegger's Nietzsche interpretations could be regarded as Heidegger's own thoughts. Alan D. Schrift reports a story about Heidegger. According to the story, Heidegger replies the criticisms about his interpretation of Kant by saying that "it may not be good Kant, but it's excellent Heidegger."¹⁵⁸ However, this does not diminish the influence of Heidegger's interpretation of Nietzsche. His acceptance of Nietzsche's philosophy as the consummation of Western metaphysics and his evaluation of main doctrines of Nietzsche's philosophy as metaphysical doctrines are still one of the main themes of Nietzsche studies. Especially, for the studies concerning Nietzsche's theory of knowledge, it is indispensable to confront with claims concerning the metaphysical character of the doctrine of the will to power and of Nietzsche's philosophy.

Heidegger is not the only commentator, who accuses Nietzsche of doing metaphysics. John Richardson, who is an analytically oriented scholar, also claims that the doctrine of the will to power is a metaphysical doctrine. Like Heidegger did between the early 1960's and 1970's, Richardson is one of the main figures of current Nietzsche studies. Because of this and the reasons that will be presented in the remainder of this paragraph, I feel compelled to include Richardson's claims about the metaphysical character of the doctrine of the will to power. First of all, nowadays, as in the case of all other domains of philosophy, Nietzsche interpretations tend to be more analytical; most of the recent Nietzsche studies have been the products of the scholars of analytic philosophy. Especially in the English-speaking world, analytical philosophy is regarded as the only way of doing philosophy.¹⁵⁹ Actually, being an analytical thinker, or doing philosophy in accordance with analytical methods, has become the basic properties for getting a "job" in the universities and colleges. In his

¹⁵⁸ Alan D. Schrift, *Nietzsche and the Question of Interpretation: between hermeneutics and deconstruction*, New York: Routledge, 1990, p. 14. Originally quoted in Bernd Magnus, *Heidegger's Metahistory of philosophy: Amor Fati, Being and Truth*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1970, p. 80.

¹⁵⁹ In the "Introduction" of *The Future for Philosophy*, (ed. Brian Leiter, New York: Oxford University Press, 2004, pp. 1-23.) Brian Leiter explains the benefits and advantages of analytical philosophy contrasting with Continental Philosophy, in great detail.

“Memorandum”¹⁶⁰ for the students, planning to do a dissertation on Nietzsche, Brain Leiter explains how to write a “good” dissertation and get a good job after finishing the dissertation. Leiter’s first advice to the doctoral students is to avoid writing a “philosophically superficial and unsophisticated” dissertation, like the works of Walter Kaufmann and Tracy B. Strong. According to Leiter, the model of a scholarly good work could be found in Maudemarie Clark’s *Nietzsche on Truth and Philosophy*, and John Richardson’s *Nietzsche’s System*. “These are,” says Leiter, “studies that are philosophically serious *and* textually scrupulous.”¹⁶¹

Briefly put, Richardson claims that, by this doctrine, Nietzsche proposes a metaphysical principle as he mentioned in his *Philosophy in the Tragic Age of the Greeks*. There, Nietzsche writes that “[w]hat drove” Thales to claim that “*water* is the primal origin and the womb of all things . . . was a metaphysical conviction which had its origin in a mystic intuition. We meet it in every philosophy, together with the ever-renewed attempts at a more suitable expression, this proposition that ‘all things are one.’”¹⁶²

Actually, such claims sound implausible, when we see the passages where Nietzsche expresses his aversion to the metaphysicians and to the Western metaphysics. For example, he calls himself as a “godless anti-metaphysician,”¹⁶³ and, when he defines the epistemological starting point for himself writes “[p]rofound aversion to reposing once and for all in any one total view of the world.”¹⁶⁴ He further writes “I mistrust all systematizers and I avoid them. The

¹⁶⁰ Brain Leiter, “Memorandum,” May 2003, (accessed August 18, 2006), <http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/Nietmemo.htm>.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, However, Babette Babich, who is another highly influential Nietzsche scholar, harshly criticizes the English-speaking analytically formed Nietzsche scholars for their manner in studying Nietzsche’s philosophy. She says “the beauty of being an American or British analytic philosopher is that *nothing* compels you to read Heidegger (or anyone else) to read Nietzsche,” and she adds, by footnoting this claim, “[y]ou need not read much Nietzsche to read Nietzsche: you can begin and end with *Zarathustra*—realizing the nightmarish augury Nietzsche imagined in *Ecce Homo*.” (Babette Babich, “Heidegger’s Relation to Nietzsche’s Thinking: On Connivance, Nihilism, and Value,” *New Nietzsche Studies* 3, no. 1/2 (Winter 1999), (accessed August 28, 2006), <http://www.fordham.edu/philosophy/lc/babich/connive.htm>).

¹⁶² PTAG, pp. 38-39.

¹⁶³ GS, §344, p. 283.

¹⁶⁴ WP, §470, p. 262.

will to a system is a lack of integrity.”¹⁶⁵ However, it is not easy to discard such claims by simply saying that Nietzsche is opposed to all metaphysical views. Therefore, they should be studied thoroughly and carefully. Now, let us see how Heidegger and Richardson base their arguments for the metaphysical character of Nietzsche’s doctrine of the will to power respectively.

2.4.1 Heidegger’s Case: Metaphysics as forgetfulness of Being

Before going into details of Heidegger’s claim that Nietzsche is “*the* last metaphysician of the West,” it should be mentioned that there are three reading strategies that Heidegger applies in his reading of Nietzsche, as well as other thinkers.¹⁶⁶ Actually, these are, for him, somewhat the structure of thinking. The first strategy is to discover “the unsaid” or “the unthought” in a thinker’s thought. The unsaid in what is said and the unthought in what is thought, to Heidegger, is “the Truth of Being.” In other words, thinkers of the Western philosophy, by their main concepts, i.e., *idea* of Plato, *Absolute Spirit* in Hegel, etc., refer to the being of the entities. Throughout their philosophical works, they try to answer the question “What is Being?” by their main concepts, or rather, they try to explain “what everything is, just qua *Being*.”¹⁶⁷ This question, for Heidegger, is the “guiding question,” yet the crucial question is that concerning the meaning of Being, which is the “grounding question.” According to Heidegger, metaphysics does not question the meaning of Being. However, without answering this question, it is not possible to answer the question concerning beings. At the beginning of *Being and Time*, Heidegger writes:

Do we in our time have an answer to the question of what we really mean by the word ‘being’? Not at all. So it is fitting that we should raise anew *the question of the meaning of Being*. But are we nowadays even perplexed at our inability to understand

¹⁶⁵ TI, §26, p. 470

¹⁶⁶ See, Schrift, pp. 13-52, for a detailed discussion of Heidegger’s reading strategies and methodological choices that he employed in his reading of Nietzsche.

¹⁶⁷ Robert B. Pippin, “Nietzsche, Heidegger, and the Metaphysics of Modernity,” in *Nietzsche and Modern German Thought*, ed. Keith Ansell-Pearson, London: Routledge, 1991, p. 290.

the expression 'Being'? Not at all. So first of all we must reawaken an understanding for the meaning of this question.¹⁶⁸

Heidegger avers that this question is never asked in the history of the Western thought, and accuses the thinkers of forgetting the Being. However, Being is still there in the form of unsaid or unthought in philosophical discourse of the Western thought. According to Heidegger, history of the Western metaphysics is the history of the forgetfulness of Being. This forgetfulness is rooted at the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle. They regarded Being as a given universal, which are only accessible or understandable through particular beings; i.e., Plato's account of Being as *eidos* or Idea. For Heidegger, this account of Being has contributed to the development of "a dogma . . . which not only declares the question about the meaning of Being to be superfluous, but sanctions its complete neglect."¹⁶⁹ Under the influence of this dogma, Being is regarded as "the most universal and the emptiest"¹⁷⁰ concept through the history of Western thought. Conceptualized as such, the concept Being becomes indefinable; that is, "it resists every attempt at definition."¹⁷¹ Actually, for Heidegger, it is used in a way that it does not require any definition anymore; that is, it is used as if its meaning is so evident that it needs no definition. The concept of Being, which once was a very perplexing, disturbing and hidden for the ancients, at the end, becomes self-evident. This is the meaning of the "forgetfulness of Being"; the meaning of Being is taken for granted without questioning. That is, while the Western metaphysics tries to understand being as presence, it forgets Being which makes this presence possible. Although it is forgotten, the traces of Being are there below the surface meaning of the discourses or the texts of the Western metaphysics. Therefore, Heidegger searches for the traces of this forgotten ground (the unsaid) in the works of the philosophers (the said) to bring it into the light. Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche

¹⁶⁸ Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. by John Macquarrie & Edward Robinson, New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1962, p. 19.

¹⁶⁹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, p. 21.

¹⁷⁰ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, p. 21.

¹⁷¹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, p. 21.

proceeds on this ground; that is, he tries to retrieve the unsaid in the works of Nietzsche. Let us return to Heidegger's elaboration of Nietzsche's philosophy as the culmination of metaphysics with this brief explanation of Heidegger's methodology in our minds.

As we have seen that, for Heidegger, to understand what a philosopher or a text actually expresses we should search for the unsaid in the said. Because, for Heidegger, "[t]he 'doctrine' of a thinker is that which, within what is said, remains unsaid, that to which we are exposed so that we might expend ourselves on it."¹⁷² This conception of the unsaid has an equivocal meaning concerning Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche. The first one is that *Nachlaß* and *The Will to Power* are the unsaid in the published books of Nietzsche, which simply are the said. It is this meaning of the unsaid that has led Heidegger to regard *Nachlaß* as Nietzsche's philosophy proper and *The Will to Power* as his *magnum opus*.

Nietzsche's philosophy proper, the fundamental position on the basis of which he speaks . . . in all the writings he himself published, did not assume a final form and was not itself published in any book, neither in the decade between 1879 and 1889 nor during the years preceding. What Nietzsche himself published during his creative life was always foreground . . . His philosophy proper was left behind as posthumous, unpublished work.¹⁷³

The second meaning of the unsaid is related to his notion of unthought, which grounds thinking. The unsaid can be understood through the unthought. Heidegger claims that approaching a text in a purely historical way, which, for him, accepts that our background is "what is handed down to us by tradition," "prevents us from hearing the language of the thinkers."¹⁷⁴ Actually, for Heidegger, we are captives of, and destined to, this inheritance. Our reliance upon this inheritance is one of "the vast self-deceptions" of humanity. Because

¹⁷² Martin Heidegger, "Plato's Doctrine of Truth", trans. by Thomas Sheehan, in *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeill, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 155.

¹⁷³ Martin Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, trans. by David Farrell Krell, San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991, vol. I, pp. 8-9.

¹⁷⁴ Martin Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking*, trans. by J. Glenn Gray, New York: Harper & Row, 1968, p. 76.

when we accept this inheritance as our backgrounds, our thoughts are limited and determined by it; it prevents the development of genuine thinking. As Heidegger says “we must remain entangled [in this self deception] as long as we are still not really thinking.”¹⁷⁵ Under the influence of this self-deception, we take the language or text as mere expressions, which set forth the views of the philosopher. However, the language of the philosopher tells us “what is,” not his views. It is not so easy to hear what the language of the philosopher tells us. For Heidegger, in order to hear it “[w]e must acknowledge and respect it.”¹⁷⁶ In other words, we must let the thoughts of the philosopher to show themselves in their uniqueness without imposing our inherited categories of understanding upon themselves. We must let it to show its inexhaustible meanings which remain hidden at the depths of his thought. It is the unthought in the thought of the philosopher that causes these inexhaustible meanings to remain hidden. What Heidegger means by unthought is not a deficiency in the thought of the philosopher, on the contrary, it is what makes his thoughts richer and more original. “What is unthought in a thinker’s thought is not a lack inherent in his thought. What is *un*-thought is there in each case only as the *un-thought*. The more original the thinking, the richer will be what is unthought in it.”¹⁷⁷ The unthought in the thought of the philosopher cannot be understood by the common mode of comprehension, and it always remains incomprehensible to this mode of comprehension. Even the unthought is labeled as untruth by the common mode of comprehension. Because this mode of comprehension is so proud of its power of comprehending everything; if it could not comprehend something then it denies it as something absurd and untrue. Instead of questioning its own power of comprehension it blames the unthought as incomprehensible. However, for Heidegger, because of its conviction that it can know everything knowable, this mode of comprehension could not respect and acknowledge the thought of the thinker which is necessary for comprehending

¹⁷⁵ Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking*, p. 76.

¹⁷⁶ Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking*, p. 76.

¹⁷⁷ Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking*, p. 76.

the unthought. Therefore, the unthought could not be comprehended by the common mode of thought which we inherited from our ancestors. Heidegger proposes a mode of comprehension which show respect and acknowledge the thoughts of the thinker. Only then we can hear what the thinker's thought actually mean; only through respect and acknowledgment we can hear what is hidden at the depths of the thinker's thought in the mode of unthought. "For acknowledgment and respect call for a readiness to let our own attempts at thinking be over come, again and again, by what is unthought in the thinker's thought."¹⁷⁸ According to Heidegger, this requires a face-to-face confrontation and converse. This encounter could take two different forms; or rather it could be performed in two different manners. The first one is to encounter with the thinker's thought, which requires "magnifying still further what is great in his thought," only then, for Heidegger, "we will enter into what is unthought in his thought."¹⁷⁹ The second manner of encounter is to counter, which minimizes what is great in his thought. In countering with his thought, we reduce what is significant in his thought into the status of a mere presumption, belonging to our common mode of comprehension. That is, it loses its all significance and depth; it becomes obvious. When the greatness of the thought of a thinker diminished by such a counter, it makes no difference to praise its owner as a great thinker; "It makes no difference if we assert in passing that Kant was nonetheless a very significant thinker. Such praises from below are always an insult."¹⁸⁰ Therefore, in order to comprehend what a thinker's thought really means, or what is unthought in the thought of the thinker, we must leave sound common sense, which ignores unthought as incomprehensible. Because, under the domination of this sound common sense, for Heidegger, "notwithstanding many exaggerations and dark allusions, everything Nietzsche offers to our thought looks largely as if

¹⁷⁸ Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking*, p. 77.

¹⁷⁹ Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking*, p. 77.

¹⁸⁰ Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking*, p. 77.

it were perfectly obvious . . . But that is a pure illusion.”¹⁸¹ To get rid of this illusion we must find out what is unthought in Nietzsche’s philosophy.

As we have seen, it is this unthought on which the thought of a philosopher is based. In Nietzsche’s thought, for Heidegger, what is unthought is “the Truth of Being.” Actually, it is the same as what remains unthought in the thought of Western metaphysics through its history. All of Nietzsche’s key concepts, i.e., “will to power,” “eternal return,” “*Übermensch*,” are to be understood or comprehended through this unthought question of the truth of Being. Actually, these concepts, for Heidegger, are basic metaphysical concepts. To illustrate, for the doctrine of the *Übermensch*, Heidegger writes that “[t]he doctrine of the superman, which by its very nature can never be an anthropology, belongs, like every metaphysical doctrine of man, among the basic doctrines of every metaphysics; it belongs to the doctrine of the Being of beings.”¹⁸²

Then, to comprehend what Nietzsche really thought we must return to what is unsaid (*Nachlaß*) in what he said (his published books by himself) and search for what is unthought in the unsaid. In other words, “[w]hat Nietzsche really thought is to be found in his *Nachlaß*, and even there we find what Nietzsche really thought only in the form of what is unthought.”¹⁸³ Moreover, what remains unthought is the question of the truth of Being, which is also the characteristic of the traditional Western metaphysics. Therefore, Heidegger suggests that if we want to reach Nietzsche’s philosophy proper we should regard him as the culmination of Western metaphysics, and then to proceed to the question of what is unthought in his thought, or to question of the truth of Being. In his *Nietzsche*, Heidegger asserts that “we can never succeed in arriving at Nietzsche’s philosophy proper if we have not in our questioning conceived of Nietzsche as the end of Western metaphysics and proceeded to the entirely different question of the truth of Being.”¹⁸⁴ Here, the culmination of metaphysics

¹⁸¹ Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking*, p. 78.

¹⁸² Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking*, p. 78.

¹⁸³ Schrift, p. 15.

¹⁸⁴ Martin Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. I, p. 10.

means that if we, following Heidegger's suggestion, have succeed in arriving at Nietzsche's philosophy proper, in which the question of the truth of Being is unthought, then it will be possible to think this formerly unthought; in short, it will become possible to think about the question of the truth of Being.

The second strategy that Heidegger applies in his reading of Nietzsche is that "every thinker thinks only one single thought."¹⁸⁵ Actually, for Heidegger, "[w]ith the term *thinker* we name those exceptional human beings who are destined to think one single thought, a thought that is always 'about' *beings as a whole*. Each thinker thinks only one *single thought*."¹⁸⁶ This is characteristic of every genuine thinker, and he differs from a researcher or a scientist. That is, as Heidegger puts it, while a researcher needs new discoveries and innovations, a genuine thinker needs to think about one single thought. Heidegger, by using this strategy, systematizes Nietzsche's philosophy. The one and the single thought, which Nietzsche thinks, is the eternal recurrence of the same. It is this thought, around which all of Nietzsche's philosophy is centered. Then, if every thinker thinks only one single thought, and if that one single thought of Nietzsche is the eternal recurrence of the same, then all other major themes of his philosophy are the same. Because all of these doctrines are about beings as a whole.

The five main rubrics . . . —"nihilism," "revaluation of all values hitherto," "will to power," "eternal recurrence of the same," and "Overman"—each portrays Nietzsche's metaphysics from just *one* perspective, although in each case it is a perspective that defines the whole. Thus Nietzsche's metaphysics grasped only when what is named in these five headings can be thought—that is, essentially experienced—in its primordial and heretofore merely intimated conjunction.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁵ Martin Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking*, p. 50.

¹⁸⁶ Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. III, p. 4. According to Heidegger, thinkers are one-sided, and this side is assigned to them at the beginnings of the history of thinking by the saying Periander of Corinth: "*Meleta to pan*," which means "Take into care beings as a whole." (*Ibid.*, p. 5).

¹⁸⁷ Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. IV, pp. 9-10. Elsewhere, Heidegger, substituting "justice" for "overman," regards these five main doctrines of Nietzsche's philosophy as the expressions of his metaphysics: "'Will to power,' 'nihilism,' 'the eternal return of the same,' 'the overman,' and 'justice' are the five fundamental expressions of Nietzsche's metaphysics." (*Nietzsche*, Vol. III, p. 189.)

These five main themes are the same in the sense that in all of them what is unthought is the same, namely the question of the truth of Being. In relation to the doctrine of the eternal recurrence of the same this question becomes the question of Being and Time. That is, when Nietzsche thinks about the eternal recurrence of the same, for Heidegger, he “thinks and meditates on Being, that is, on the will to power as eternal recurrence.”¹⁸⁸ In this doctrine, eternity appears “not as a static ‘now,’ nor as a sequence of ‘nows’ rolling off into the infinite, but as the ‘now’ that bends back into itself.”¹⁸⁹ According to Heidegger, this is “the concealed essence of time,” and Nietzsche’s thinking of Being as eternal return “means thinking Being as Time,” yet he “does not think it as the *question* of Being and Time”¹⁹⁰ as in the case of Plato and Aristotle when they consider Being as *ousia* (enduring presence). Because Nietzsche is not concerned with this question, he belongs to that long tradition of Western metaphysics.

The third strategy of Heidegger is related to his belief that Nietzsche is a metaphysician and his philosophy is the culmination of the Western metaphysics. Because, for him, it is the condition on which Nietzsche’s being a serious philosopher depends. In other words, Heidegger thinks that every serious philosophy must be metaphysical otherwise it is nothing at all. It is this belief which leads Heidegger to take Nietzsche a metaphysical thinker. He explains his reflection on Nietzsche’s metaphysics in the following way:

The fact that we are reflecting on Nietzsche’s metaphysics does not mean that, in addition to considering his ethics and his epistemology and his aesthetics, we are also and above all taking note of his metaphysics; rather it means that we are trying to take Nietzsche seriously as a thinker.¹⁹¹

Then, it seems that whole of Heidegger’s aim in presenting Nietzsche as a metaphysical thinker is to show that he is a genuine philosopher. According to

¹⁸⁸ Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. I, p. 20.

¹⁸⁹ Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. I, p. 20.

¹⁹⁰ Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. I, p. 20.

¹⁹¹ Heidegger, “The Word of Nietzsche: ‘God is Dead,’” in *The Question Concerning Technology, and Other Essays*, trans. by William Lowitt, New York: Harper & Row, 1977, pp. 54-55.

Schrift, “Heidegger’s metaphysicalization” of Nietzsche is “the consequence of his desire to . . . rescue Nietzsche from the common, yet erroneous, judgment that he is a ‘poet-philosopher’ or a ‘philosopher of life.’”¹⁹² Heidegger defines metaphysics as “the truth of what *is* as such in its entirety.”¹⁹³ In this sense, metaphysics is ontology; actually, for Heidegger, “[a]ny metaphysical thinking is onto-logy or it is nothing at all.”¹⁹⁴ For this reason, Nietzsche’s doctrine of the will to power is an ontological, hence a metaphysical, doctrine; it is his answer to the question “What is there?” or “What are beings?”; that is, beings, or entities are will to power; will to power is what there *is*. For Heidegger, such claims about “what there is” presupposes Being; or to put rightly, when we try to explain what there is we behave as if we are familiar with the sense or meaning of Being. We mention beings, or “what there is,” without mentioning Being, which grounds beings, as if the meaning of it clear and accessible to all of us; hence, Heidegger’s famous charge of the forgetfulness of Being as typical characterization of the Western metaphysics.

To summarize, Heidegger uses three strategies in reading Nietzsche’s works, both published and unpublished. Indeed, he uses these strategies in general for reading philosophical texts. His first strategy is to discover the unsaid or unthought in what is said or thought in those texts. To understand a thinker’s thought, or what he really said, for Heidegger, we should discover what is unsaid or unthought in his works. Heidegger claims that what is unsaid is “the truth of Being.” Without questioning the truth of Being, all the philosophers have used Being as a grounding principle in their answers to the question of being, or “what there is.” However, Being is always assumed, and remains unexplained, in those texts. That is, as a grounding principle, the concept of Being is overtly or covertly used by the philosophers, yet it is neither questioned nor explained; it has been forgotten or ignored. This is what Heidegger names as “the forgetfulness of Being.” According to him, this forgetfulness is the characteristic

¹⁹² Schrift, p. 19.

¹⁹³ Heidegger, “The Word of Nietzsche,” p. 54.

¹⁹⁴ Heidegger, “The Word of Nietzsche,” p. 55.

of the Western metaphysics. By his doctrine of the will to power, Heidegger claims, Nietzsche tries to answer the question of being without questioning Being. Hence, Nietzsche remains in the tradition of Western Metaphysics. The second strategy of Heidegger is his conviction that every genuine thinker thinks only one thought, which is always about beings as a whole. Of course, for Heidegger, Nietzsche was a genuine thinker, and his thoughts were about beings as a whole. This means that all of Nietzsche's doctrines and thoughts, although they seem to be very unsystematic, constitute a systematic unity. Heidegger's third strategy is to consider all serious philosophy as metaphysics. Since Heidegger accepts Nietzsche's philosophy as the consummation of Western metaphysics, it is one of the most serious of all philosophical thoughts in the history of Western thought. Therefore, Nietzsche's philosophy is a metaphysical one.

After presenting Heidegger's reading strategies which support his understanding of Nietzsche as a metaphysician, let us return to the issue of the will to power as a metaphysical doctrine. As we know, Heidegger takes *Nachlaß* and *The Will to Power* as Nietzsche's philosophy proper. Because of the fact that the main concept or doctrine, which dominates all of these notes, is the will to power, and, for Heidegger, it is a metaphysical doctrine, he suggests that Nietzsche's "philosophy can be called the metaphysics of the will to power."¹⁹⁵

Heidegger starts his discussion of the metaphysics of the will to power by showing that the literal meaning of the phrase is not what Nietzsche means by it. He asserts that "will" is to strive or lust for something that we do not have, and "power" means to exercise force, then "[w]ill to power is evidently striving for the possibility to exercise force, striving for the possession of power."¹⁹⁶ For Heidegger, such an explanation of will to power implies a deficiency which would lead to romanticism; that is, it is the characteristics of the romanticism to lust for something that is not possessed. In addition, will to power, as a drive to increase power, also implies a drive to violence. However, such an

¹⁹⁵ Heidegger, "The Word of Nietzsche," p. 76.

¹⁹⁶ Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. III, p. 193.

understanding of will to power, for Heidegger, is at odds with what Nietzsche means by this phrase. After showing the inadequacy of understanding the phrase will to power in its literal meaning, Heidegger starts a more detailed investigation of the phrase to find out what Nietzsche means by it. Heidegger firstly tries to understand what Nietzsche means by will or willing.

Willing is not wishing or striving for something, rather it is commanding. That is, “[t]o will is to will-to-be-master.”¹⁹⁷ However, this commanding or willing to be master should not be understood in terms of the traditional relation between master and slave; that is, this commanding should be distinguished from that of the master’s. Because will to power is also operative in the slave, yet not as wishing to free himself from the master’s domination over him; slave as a slave or underling makes the master dependent on him, and he becomes indispensable for the master, and as such dominates the master. “Being a servant is still a form of will to power. Willing never be a willing to be master if the will were merely a wishing and striving, instead of being—from top to bottom—a command.”¹⁹⁸

Heidegger asserts that commanding is self-overcoming. To command is to be master over himself in order to be ready for exploiting possibilities of efficacious action for self-overcoming; it is to have a disposition for such an exploitation. What is commanded in the command is to execute this disposal, and who obeys the command is the one that who commands. Hence, “the one who commands proves superior to himself in that he ventures even his own self.”¹⁹⁹ Who commands and who obeys are the same; by commanding and obeying the command, the commanding one overcomes himself. Heidegger warns us that the will does not will something which it does not have, on the contrary, what the will wills is it already has; that is, it wants itself; it wants to become more. In Heidegger’s words, “[w]hat the will wills it has already. For the

¹⁹⁷ Heidegger, “The Word of Nietzsche,” p. 77.

¹⁹⁸ Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. III, p. 194.

¹⁹⁹ Heidegger, “The Word of Nietzsche,” p. 77.

will wills its will. Its will is what has willed. The will wills itself.”²⁰⁰ This will wills itself to become stronger, which means that it wills beyond itself. Here “stronger” means “more power.” As in the case of will, the essence of power is to overcome itself; “[t]o the essence of power belongs the overcoming of itself.”²⁰¹

Power is also commanding, and it commands itself to overpower the attained level of power. Heidegger asserts that power remains as power only in so far as it enhances itself. When it could not enhance itself, or the enhancement of power pauses, then there is a decline in power. However, this power-enhancement is not for the sake of attaining next level of power, but for the sake of attaining power over itself. Then, power, as in the case of will, is directed toward itself; that is, it always overpowers itself because this overpowering is its essence. “Power is thus continually under way ‘to’ itself.”²⁰² In the light of such an understanding of “will” and “power,” the phrase will to power seems to imply power for power. Here, for Heidegger, “power for power” means “empowering for overpowering,” which is the essence of power.

After presenting what will and power means in Nietzsche’s philosophy, Heidegger concludes that they are the same. However, they are not the same as two separate concepts, but “[t]hey are the same in the sense of their essential coherence in the unity of *one* essence,”²⁰³ which is will to power. When they are posited as separate concepts, the essence of will to power cannot be grasped. Because will, when willing itself, wills power for power. Heidegger, in a conclusive passage writes:

In the name “will to power” the word “power” connotes nothing less than the essence of the way in which the will wills itself inasmuch as it is a commanding . . . will and power are, in the will to power, not merely linked together; but rather the will, as the will to will, is itself the will to power in the sense of the empowering to power. But power has its essence in the fact

²⁰⁰ Heidegger, “The Word of Nietzsche,” p. 77.

²⁰¹ Heidegger, “The Word of Nietzsche,” p. 77.

²⁰² Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. III, p. 195.

²⁰³ Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. III, p. 195.

that it stands to the will as the will standing within that will. The will to power is the essence of the power. It manifests the unconditional essence of the will, which as pure will wills itself.²⁰⁴

After presenting what is the meaning of the will to power in Nietzsche's sense, Heidegger proceeds to explain the metaphysics of the will to power by relating it with Nietzsche's discussion of value. For Heidegger, Nietzsche's metaphysics is "the metaphysics of values,"²⁰⁵ and it is very important to understand what Nietzsche means by value for understanding his metaphysics. Heidegger asserts that will to power involves both preservation and enhancement of power; that is, "enhancement of power is at the same time in itself the preservation of power. Power can only empower itself to an overpowering by commanding *both* enhancement *and* preservation."²⁰⁶ By this command, power posits also the conditions of enhancement and preservation. Heidegger, to explain the nature of these conditions, quotes Nietzsche: "The viewpoint of 'value' is the viewpoint of conditions of preservation and enhancement for complex forms of relative life-duration within the flux of becoming."²⁰⁷ Heidegger concludes that the conditions of preservation and enhancement are "viewpoints." For him, these viewpoints belong to a particular seeing; that is, these viewpoints belong to the seeing, or the perspective, of will to power. This perspective of will to power is not a mere perspective of vision, on the contrary, it is the perspective of the will to power which looks toward conditions of enhancement and preservation. Heidegger names these conditions of enhancement and preservation as the conditions of will to power. Under the perspectival seeing of will to power the conditions of will to power, which are viewpoints, appear as values. Referring Nietzsche's aphorism §715 of *The Will to Power*, Heidegger asserts that "[v]alue is 'essentially the viewpoint' of the

²⁰⁴ Heidegger, "The Word of Nietzsche," pp. 78-79.

²⁰⁵ Heidegger, "The Word of Nietzsche," p. 71.

²⁰⁶ Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. III, p. 197.

²⁰⁷ WP, §715, p. 380.

powering-reckoning seeing of will to power.”²⁰⁸ As Nietzsche sees life as will to power, Heidegger concludes that life in its essence is the value-positing will; that is, will to power posits the conditions of preservation and enhancement of power. Furthermore, will to power, as the value-positing will, is also the principle, which guides the evaluation of values. As we know that, for Nietzsche, everything real is will to power, therefore, this value-positing will is the “fundamental characteristic of everything real.”²⁰⁹ This means, for Heidegger, that Nietzsche thinks beings in terms of values. Heidegger writes that “the way we think through beings as such in their truth, that is, truth as the thinking of will to power, inevitably becomes thinking according to values.”²¹⁰ Hence, by the doctrine of the will to power, Nietzsche transforms truth and Being into values. According to Heidegger, because of this translation Nietzsche remains within the metaphysical tradition.

Furthermore, Heidegger asserts that Descartes’ search for certainty takes the form of security in Nietzsche’s doctrine of the will to power. What the will to power posits as values are the conditions of preservation and enhancement. By positing “the preservation, i.e., the securing, of its constancy and stability, as a necessary value,” the will to power “at the same time justifies the necessity of such securing in everything that is.”²¹¹ This making secure means certainty, which is the principle of modern metaphysics. Heidegger claims that Nietzsche has placed this principle into the will to power; that is, Nietzsche has replaced the Cartesian *ego cogito* with the will to power. Thus, Nietzsche remains within the metaphysical tradition:

Despite all his overturnings and revaluings of metaphysics, Nietzsche remains in the unbroken line of the metaphysical tradition when he calls that which is established and made fast

²⁰⁸ Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. III, p. 198.

²⁰⁹ Heidegger, “The Word of Nietzsche,” p. 71.

²¹⁰ Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. III, pp. 199-200.

²¹¹ Heidegger, “The Word of Nietzsche,” p. 73.

in the will to power for its own preservation purely and simply
Being, or what is in being, or truth.²¹²

Moreover, Nietzsche's transformation of Being into value, Heidegger claims, brings the consummation of metaphysics. Nietzsche by the will to power attempts at the overcoming of nihilism, which is the devaluation of the highest values,²¹³ and, this overcoming of nihilism takes place through re-valuation of all values. The principle that guides this process of re-valuation is the will to power; that is, value becomes the principle of this overcoming. For Heidegger, "value does not let Being be Being, does not let it be what it is as Being itself."²¹⁴ Because of this, for him, Nietzsche's overcoming of nihilism becomes the consummation of metaphysics, because "now metaphysics not only does not think Being itself, but this not-thinking of Being clothes itself in the illusion that it does think Being in the most exalted manner, in that it esteems Being as a value," hence, "all the questions concerning Being become and remain superfluous."²¹⁵

As Heidegger's three reading strategies suggest, his main strategy seems to be first accepting Nietzsche as a metaphysical thinker and his philosophy as metaphysics, then trying to show that it is really so. To show that Nietzsche is a metaphysical thinker, Heidegger tries to show that one of the most important doctrines of Nietzsche's philosophy, the doctrine of the will to power, is a metaphysical doctrine. Heidegger bases his argument on the relation between the will to power and value. Emphasizing Nietzsche's characterization of the world as the chaotic world of quanta of power struggling with each other for increasing their power, Heidegger claims that the preservation and enhancement of power appear as values. That is, every power quantum evaluates the rest of the world according to possibilities for increasing its power; each quantum of power interprets the world from the perspective of increasing its power. The conditions

²¹² Heidegger, "The Word of Nietzsche," p. 84.

²¹³ "What does nihilism mean? *That the highest values devalue themselves*" (WP, §2).

²¹⁴ Heidegger, "The Word of Nietzsche," p. 104.

²¹⁵ Heidegger, "The Word of Nietzsche," p. 104.

for the preservation and increase of power are values, and every power quantum posits these values. Because of this, Heidegger claims that the will to power is essentially the value-positing will. As everything is, for Nietzsche, will to power, the essence of everything real is this value-positing will. Further, value-positing of the will to power is nothing more than Descartes' search for certainty. That is, by positing values, which are simply the conditions of preservation and enhancement, will to power tries to secure its continuity and stability. In Nietzsche's case, if we follow Heidegger, Descartes' secure base for the epistemological edifice, which is presented in his famous phrase "I think therefore I am," becomes the preservation of the will to power, who posits the conditions of preservation as values. In other words, the epistemological foundation of Cartesian philosophy "I think" becomes "I exist," or "I preserve myself"; hence, the conditions of preservation and enhancement, or values, become the truth conditions. As such, for Heidegger, Being and truth are transformed into values; this is why Heidegger calls Nietzsche's metaphysics as "the metaphysics of values." Moreover, to claim that Nietzsche's metaphysics is metaphysics of value amounts to claiming that it is, at the same time, metaphysics of subjectivity. That is, value is always subjective; it is always posited by a subject. Thus, the subject, which is simply will to power as a quantum or constellation of power, becomes the measure of everything, in Nietzsche's philosophy.

Consequently, for Heidegger, Nietzsche's philosophy remains within the boundaries of Western metaphysics. By the doctrine of will to power, Nietzsche proposes a metaphysical system, which is, for Heidegger, inverted Platonism. This means that the metaphysics Heidegger attributes to Nietzsche is similar to that of Plato. By the declaration of the death of God through mouth of the madman, Nietzsche announces the dethroning of the supra-sensory world of Ideas, which supports and determines the sensory world. The world of Platonic Ideas, which is regarded as the real world, is no longer the ground of the sensuous world, in which we live. In Plato's metaphysical system, entities in the sensory world are valued according to their closeness to Ideas, and truth is

determined according to this closeness. However, for Heidegger, Nietzsche gives the function of the world of Ideas to the will to power. That is, it is the will to power, who determines and values the sensory world and truth by positing values, or the conditions of preservation and enhancement. Therefore, what has Nietzsche done is nothing more than replacing the world of ideas with the world of values. Hence, Nietzsche is a metaphysical thinker.

Actually, Heidegger's discussion is far more detailed and longer than this brief presentation of it, yet it is not possible for me to present all of his discussion. This brief presentation is enough for the purpose of the present study. Now, let us try to find out if Heidegger's ascription of metaphysics is correct.

As we have seen earlier, Nietzsche is against metaphysics, and he sharply criticizes Western metaphysics. How could, then, Heidegger accuse him of doing metaphysics? Either Nietzsche is actually doing metaphysics and not aware of this fact, or Heidegger misinterprets, consciously or unconsciously, Nietzsche's thought and tries to make him a metaphysical thinker. These two possible answers could be true at the same time, but, for me, it is not possible. I could not accept the first one as an answer. Because, then, Nietzsche ceases to be a genuine thinker. If he is not aware of this fact then he does not deserve to be called even a thinker. However, it is very ironic to see that Heidegger calls Nietzsche as a genuine thinker at the cost of making him a metaphysical thinker. Hence, I reject the first possible answer.

Now, we have only one possible answer; that is, consciously or unconsciously, Heidegger misinterprets Nietzsche, and makes an unfair claim about his philosophy. In the light of his reading strategies, Heidegger's Nietzsche interpretation may easily be regarded as "excellent Heidegger." That is, applying those reading strategies, which is applied by him to the thinkers before Nietzsche, Heidegger makes Nietzsche's philosophy one of the main metaphysical systems of the Western philosophy; he prunes away all of the differences, and the originalities, of Nietzsche's philosophy; especially, Nietzsche's critique of Western metaphysics' search for a stable and unchanging world; metaphysical and true world of Being. Nietzsche's critique is directly

against the notion, and of course the world, of Being, which has been at the center of Western metaphysics. Western metaphysics, from its beginning posits a real world beyond and over the sensory world, i.e., Plato's world of Ideas. Heidegger, ignoring this side of Nietzsche's thought, places him in the long tradition of Western metaphysics as the consummation of that tradition. According to Heidegger, Nietzsche's metaphysics is an inverted Platonism, which means, for Heidegger, Nietzsche posits the sensuous world over the suprasensuous world of Ideas.

For Plato suprasensuous is the true world. It stands over all, as what sets the standard. The sensuous lies below, as the world of appearances. What stands over all is alone and from the start what sets the standard; it is therefore what is desired. After the inversion . . . the sensuous, the world of appearances, stands above; the suprasensuous, the true world, lies below.²¹⁶

Heidegger, by viewing Nietzsche's philosophy as an inverted Platonism, ignores Nietzsche's perspectivism and his continuous attacks on the Western metaphysics. Nietzsche's aim is not to correct the falsities of Platonism, or Western metaphysics, by inverting it, but to overcome it. Hence, as Ruediger H. Grimm points out, Heidegger's claim could be true "if Nietzsche were thinking in traditional conceptual terms and merely replacing an outmoded concept of static truth with a new but equally static concept."²¹⁷ However, Nietzsche does not think in the conceptual terms of the Western metaphysics. When he uses those concepts and terms, he does not use them in their traditional sense. For example, as there is no other medium to express thoughts than the language that we use, Nietzsche necessarily uses the terms "true" and "false."²¹⁸ However, he does not use these terms in their traditional sense, which presupposes a true and

²¹⁶ Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. II, p. 201.

²¹⁷ Ruediger H. Grimm, *Nietzsche's Theory of Knowledge*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977, p. 38.

²¹⁸ The following may give us a hint about Nietzsche's views about language: ". . . we think *only* in the form of language . . . *We cease to think when we refuse to do so under the constraint of language.*" (WP, §522, p. 283.) "We cannot change our means of expression at will: it is possible to understand to what extent they are mere signs. The demand for an adequate mode of expression is senseless: it is of the essence of a language, a means of expression, to express a mere relationship—" (WP, §625, p. 324.)

changeless world as the criterion of truth. Furthermore, the truths, for which the traditional metaphysics searches, are eternal and universal truths. Conversely, for Nietzsche there is neither an unchanging world nor the universal knowledge of it. The notion of an unchanging world, as well as the distinction between the real and the apparent world, are only illusions, or perspectival falsifications. As we know that the world is, for Nietzsche, a dynamic world, in which every quantum of power struggles with each other for increasing its power. There is no world other than this chaotic world, in which we live as complex power constellations. Nietzsche's perspectivism is based on this chaotic and ever-changing world of power quanta. In accordance with his perspectivism, Nietzsche defines the criterion of truth as "the enhancement of the feeling of power."²¹⁹ As this criterion shows, his use of the term "true" or "truth" has nothing to do with that of the traditional Western metaphysics. Thus, Nietzsche neither thinks in traditional conceptual terms nor replaces the old concept of static truth with another static one. Therefore, Heidegger's claims fail to make Nietzsche a metaphysical thinker.

Other than those reading strategies of Heidegger, his ignoring of Nietzsche's perspectivism is behind his accusation of Nietzsche for doing metaphysics. It is perspectivism, through which Nietzsche overcomes Western metaphysics. When we discuss Nietzsche's perspectivism in the following chapter, this point will become more clear. This ignorance maybe another Heideggerian strategy to make the way for "excellent Heidegger."

2.4.2 Richardson's Case: Metaphysics as Essence Claim

Nietzsche interpretations, with the rise of the hegemony of analytical tradition on the philosophical institutions all over the world, have become more analytical. This rising hegemony of the analytical philosophy, also, has resulted in the degradation of the non-analytical Nietzsche interpretations and honoring the analytical ones. One of the leading analytically oriented scholars of Nietzsche is John Richardson. His Nietzsche studies are very influential over the

²¹⁹ WP, §534, p. 290.

contemporary Nietzsche studies in the analytical tradition. What makes him a concern of the present study is his regarding Nietzsche's philosophy as metaphysics. Like Heidegger, Richardson believes that Nietzsche is a metaphysician, and his philosophy, which is centered on the ontology of the will to power, is a metaphysical system. Richardson devoted his book *Nietzsche's System* to show that his belief is true. At the beginning of the book, he declares his aim in writing this book as the following: "The book's project is to show that Nietzsche has a metaphysics—to show it by presenting, in conceptual and argumentative detail, a metaphysical system that both fits and clarifies what he says (writes)."²²⁰ He also declares that to show that Nietzsche has a metaphysics does not mean to "diminish" him, but to show the richness and greatness of his thought. This sound as if Richardson is following the above discussed Heideggerian reading strategies, for which a philosopher is a serious and real philosopher as long as he is a metaphysician.

Richardson's first step is to state what he means by metaphysics. According to him, those philosophical systems preceding Nietzsche are metaphysical. They are so, because they are centered systematically around a metaphysical core. This core "consists in an account of the 'essence' or 'being' of things, so that 'metaphysics' is equivalent to 'ontology'."²²¹ Here, again, Richardson seems to follow Heidegger's claim that "[a]ny metaphysical thinking is onto-logy or it is nothing at all."²²² However, his discussion of metaphysics of Nietzsche is radically different from that of Heidegger. Richardson's discussion about metaphysics of Nietzsche depends mainly on this equation. Hence, metaphysics, for Richardson, "claims a (1) *systematic* (2) *truth* (3) about *essence*."²²³ After this brief summary of his preliminary assumption about metaphysics, let us return to his discussion of the metaphysics of the will to power.

²²⁰ John Richardson, *Nietzsche's System*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, p. 3.

²²¹ Richardson, p. 3.

²²² Heidegger, "The Word of Nietzsche," p. 55.

²²³ Richardson, p. 3.

Richardson's basic claim is that by the doctrine of the will to power Nietzsche presents an ontology of power; and because ontology and metaphysics are equivalent, it is a metaphysical doctrine. Nietzsche, by this doctrine, tells us what the world basically *is*; or he tells us that the essence or being of things is will to power, which amounts to claim that "all is one" as his predecessors did. In order to support his claim, Richardson begins to analyze the meaning of the phrase "will to power" in Nietzsche's thought. He states that the surface meaning of the phrase seems to suggest that Nietzsche proposes a kind of psychological hedonism by replacing power for pleasure. That is, if we understand the phrase in its surface meaning, then Nietzsche appears to be "speaking of a human willing that aims at power over other persons as its ultimate end."²²⁴ Richardson says that will to power implies gaining power over other persons is the sole good, or the highest end, to which our other ends are directed, or aimed at. According to Richardson, this understanding of the doctrine of the will to power is not an unsupported first impression, on the contrary, it is supported by some of Nietzsche's writings, even the passages in which he expressly criticizes the very notion of psychological hedonism. Richardson lists those passages without quoting any single word from them,²²⁵ and the most crucial one is HAH, vol. I, §18, in which, for him, Nietzsche accepts psychological hedonism. I do not want to go into the details of all these passages, but I could not pass without mentioning his misunderstanding of Nietzsche's view in that passage of *Human, All too Human*. Because, Nietzsche does not accept psychological hedonism, rather he shows how the sensation of pleasure and pain contributed to the development of the famous idea of substance. In other words, there, Nietzsche presents fundamental questions of metaphysics through a brief genealogy and a critique of traditional Western metaphysics, which places a self-subsistent and unchanging substance behind the sensible world. Moreover, for metaphysics, this substance is the object of the knowing subject. Nietzsche quotes Afrikan Alexandrovich Spir as a representative of this conception of the knowing subject

²²⁴ Richardson, p. 19.

²²⁵ Those passages are GM, III, §7, WP §688, WP §702, and HAH, vol. I, §18.

and the substance: “The primary universal law of the knowing subject consists in the inner necessity of recognizing every object in itself as being in its own essence something identical with itself, thus self-existent and at bottom always the same and unchanging, in short as a substance.”²²⁶ Nietzsche claims that when we try to understand this sentence of Spir through “the history of the genesis of thought,” the real meaning of it will be revealed. According to Nietzsche, the history of thought shows us that this primary law evolved, yet how this evolution had occurred is not evident enough to understand at this stage of the history of thought. However, Nietzsche has some foresight about the way in which this evolution had occurred:

This law, too, which is here called ‘primary’, evolved: one day it will be shown how gradually, in the lower organisms, this tendency comes into being: how the purblind mole’s eyes of this organization at first never see anything but the same thing; how then, when the various pleasurable and unpleasurable stimuli become more noticeable, various different substances are gradually distinguished, but each of them with one attribute, that is to say a single relationship with such an organism.²²⁷

Nietzsche’s this foresight shows us that sensations of the pleasure and pain come into the scene later as the differentiating factor. That is, the organism, before the sensations of the pleasure and pain become more noticeable, does not, or could not, differentiate things or substances surrounding it. This implies judgment; organism makes a judgment concerning its sensations. As Nietzsche puts it, judgment is the first stage of the logical; and the essence of the judgment lies in belief, at the bottom of which there lies the sensation of pleasure or pain. As a result of these sensations of pleasure or pain, there comes a new sensation, which is, for Nietzsche, judgment in its lowest form. For Nietzsche, this shows us that “[i]n our primary condition, all that interests us organic beings in any

²²⁶ Afrikan Alexandrovich Spir, *Denken und Wirklichkeit: Versuch einer Erneuerung der kritischen Philosophie*, Leipzig: J. G. Findel, 1873, vol. 2, p. 177. Quoted in HAH, vol. I, §18, p. 21. However, Nietzsche makes no reference to Spir there, I found that this quotation belongs to Spir in Michael Steven Green, *Nietzsche and the Transcendental Tradition*, Illinois: Illinois University Press, 2002, p. 32.

²²⁷ HAH, vol. I, §18, p. 21.

thing is its relationship to us in respect of pleasure and pain.”²²⁸ This sensation of pleasure or pain is crucial to the development of the idea of the stable and unchanging world. Because, as Nietzsche puts it, when we become conscious of the sensations of pleasure or pain, we are so indulged in that sensation that “the world and every thing is devoid of interest to us, we notice no alteration in it (just as now anyone absorbed with interest in something will still not notice someone walking by him).”²²⁹ Moreover, between the states, in which we are conscious of pleasure and pain, there is the state of non-sensation or repose. Therefore, in either of two situations, the world is unchanging and there are identical things in it. That is, if we have sensation of pleasure and become conscious of it, for example, then we are so absorbed in that sensation that we lose our interest in the rest of the world, on the other hand, when we have not sensation of it, then the world becomes indifferent to us and we experience the world as a plant experiences it: “To the plants all things are usually in repose, eternal, every thing identical with itself.”²³⁰ In his brief yet insightful discussion of the genesis of the substance of the Western Metaphysics, I do not see any acceptance or appreciation of the psychological hedonism by Nietzsche. What Nietzsche tries to explain is that how the insensible and unchanging substance of the Western metaphysical thought is dependent on pleasure and pain. That is, the genealogical history of the Western thought, shows us that the idea of substance is primarily the product of the sensations of pleasure and pain; hence the knowing subject in a way creates its object. Richardson takes Nietzsche’s genealogical investigation of the substance as his own position and claims that Nietzsche accepts psychological hedonism. However, as the above discussion shows us, Nietzsche’s intention is to show that the genesis of the idea of substance is the sensation of pleasure and pain. We know that Nietzsche does not accept the idea of substance and the contemplation of the world as unchanging, and we know also that, for him, pleasure and pain are the byproduct of the will to

²²⁸ HAH, vol. I, §18, p. 21.

²²⁹ HAH, vol. I, §18, p. 21.

²³⁰ HAH, vol. I, §18, p. 21.

power. Therefore, it is not possible to interpret the above passage from *Human, All too Human* as Nietzsche's assertion of psychological hedonism.

However, Richardson rejects those approaches which take the doctrine of the will to power only as a version of psychological hedonism. These views presuppose that the doctrine of the will to power is an anthropological doctrine; that is, they take will to power as only applied to people. Richardson asserts that Nietzsche applies will to power to simpler units such as drives or forces, which Nietzsche calls as "points" or "power quanta." According to Richardson, if we understood these simpler units of the will to power, we will better understand the complex structures of the will to power, such as human beings. The application of the will to power to the simpler units, or Nietzsche's contemplation of the will to power as being such units, for Richardson, suggests that we must not understand will as something peculiar to humans; that is, will must not be understood as human willing. Since "we are constituted out of drives or forces, we don't 'will' anything in the way we ordinarily suppose."²³¹

For Richardson, power, like will, should be understood in a special way. It should not be understood as a human end, i.e., political or economical power. Richardson says that understanding of power as a human end means psychological hedonism; therefore it must be understood differently. In other words, power cannot be the highest end as pleasure is for psychological hedonism. According to Richardson, every drive has a peculiar activity, which does not essentially aim at gaining power. Furthermore, it is not possible to describe power without reference to the activities of drives. This dependence of the activities of drives, since every drive has a peculiar activity, individuates power: "This means that power is 'individuated', necessarily different in content in different wills."²³² Richardson asserts that this conception of power suggests, rather than a new end, a new telic structure different from our natural understanding of it. That is, the doctrine of the will to power is a teleological principle, yet it is different from that of the psychological hedonism in which the

²³¹ Richardson, p. 20.

²³² Richardson, p. 20.

end is the same for all drives or activities, namely pleasure. Power cannot be such an abstract and universal end. Richardson claims that drives already have differentiating internal ends in themselves, and a drive wants power about this end. “So it’s not that the sex drive . . . possesses a sense of power in the abstract, for whose sake it chooses sexuality as a means to an end; rather, it’s already polarized into valuing only specifically sexual power.”²³³ However, Richardson does not mention how this polarization occurs, he takes it for granted. Furthermore, he claims that since a drive is will to power, to say that it wants power is meaningless. Yet, immediately, he adds that a drive is a way of pursuing power in a pre-established project. “To be a will to power, it must already want something other than power. Thus each drive is a specific way of pursuing power in a project whose overall lines drawn beforehand.”²³⁴

Richardson claims that, since power is not a higher or first-order end like pleasure or political power, it could not be separated from drives. Power, he says, is the improvement of the activities of a drive; hence it could not be defined without these activities. That is, power is dependent on the activities of drives, and because of this dependence, it appears different for each drive. Every drive has different activity patterns, and power is the enhancement of them, thus, the definition of power is different for each drive. This is what Richardson means by the individuation of power. Consequently, power, “as something willed by every drive, ‘lacks content’, requiring a contingent filling out from some given case.”²³⁵ Every drive, in its search for the ways of improving its activities, goes to different directions; that is, each one of them has a different route to power. This individuation of power is, indeed, what perspectivism basically means. Furthermore, it is also “the metaphysical root for Nietzsche’s individualism in values.”²³⁶

²³³ Richardson, p. 23.

²³⁴ Richardson, p. 23.

²³⁵ Richardson, p. 24.

²³⁶ Richardson, p. 24.

If a drive, as a will to power, does not want power, then why does it bother pursuing power? It seems to me that Richardson, to reach his pre-established Nietzsche project, willingly or unwillingly misinterprets Nietzsche, like of Heidegger. Richardson's interpretation of the will to power really misses the crucial point, which lies in Nietzsche's characterization of the world as a chaos, resulting from the power struggles of the quantum or constellation of power quanta. There is no pre-established project for any quantum of power to increase its power; if there were, the world would not be chaotic one. To suppose that there is a pre-established project for every drive and they pursue power according to it is nothing but to say that the world is a well-ordered or law-driven one. Moreover, Richardson by placing an internal end into the drives as differentiating factor reduces will to power, the fundamental drive, to the status of a secondary drive. However, for Nietzsche, the will to power is the "fundamental instinct of life which aims at the expansion of power and, wishing for that, frequently risks and even sacrifices self-preservation."²³⁷ As this quotation shows, those ends presented by Richardson as the ends of drives cannot be the ends to which the enhancement of power is directed. These ends are subordinated to the will to power, in its search for enhancement of its power. Will to power is prior to the all other drives. This can be seen in his explanation of the hunger drive: "It is not possible to take hunger as the *primum mobile* . . . only later, as a result of the division of labor, after the will to power has learned to take other roads to its satisfaction, is an organism's need to appropriate *reduced* to hunger, to the need to replace what has been lost."²³⁸ Richardson misses these crucial points and continues to achieve his pre-established project; constructing a metaphysical Nietzsche.

In the remainder of his book, Richardson tries to show the systematic character of Nietzsche's philosophy by explaining how Nietzsche's views about value, truth, and ethics are centered around and compatible with this metaphysical core. At the end of book, he tries to construct Nietzsche's

²³⁷ GS, §349, p. 291-92.

²³⁸ WP, §652, p. 345.

metaphysical system as “perspectivist metaphysics.” Briefly put, Richardson starts with questioning how the power ontology can be known. He mentions two possible ways of knowing the principles of this ontology; by *intuition* or by a *transcendental argument*. Richardson claims that Nietzsche rejects intuition and immediate certainty as a possible way of knowing those principles. Since, says Richardson, Nietzsche is “highly suspicious of consciousness and stresses that what it gives us ‘inwardly’ is also just appearance, not facts.”²³⁹ The other choice, grounding the ontology of power on a transcendental argument,²⁴⁰ which regards this ontology as the condition of the possibility of experience, is also rejected by Nietzsche. According to Richardson, Nietzsche accepts such arguments “as showing that we can’t help but think or experience the world *as it is not*.”²⁴¹ In contrast, the ontology of power shows us *how* the world is. Showing that these two possible alternatives as inadequate or inappropriate ways of understanding or knowing the ontology of power, Richardson proposes his alternative based on Quine’s notion of “web of beliefs.” This time, the ontology of power regarded not as foundation, but as the center of a web. That is, “[t]he essence claims stand not as foundations (laid down first and a priori) but at the center of a web, providing the basic concepts and structures employed by all more particular views, including those ‘at the periphery’, that describe particular data.”²⁴² It is not possible to confirm or disconfirm the ontological claims at the center of the web by experiential data. Because, for Richardson, there is no way of isolating that part of the web and submitting it to test. However, they are partly confirmed or disconfirmed; that is, these claims provide the basic concepts and structures for describing experiential data, and if they are successful, then they are partly and indirectly confirmed. Richardson says that there is not a sharp border that separates the claims of Nietzsche’s power ontology from experiential data; since they are subject to appraisal through experience. Hence, for

²³⁹ Richardson, p. 287.

²⁴⁰ See, note 379.

²⁴¹ Richardson, p. 287.

²⁴² Richardson, p. 288.

Richardson, there is “a continuum or range in generality, in how broadly, hence indirectly, they bear on experience.”²⁴³ This means, for him, that the claims of Nietzsche’s power ontology are empirical and hypothetical. However, Richardson claims, Nietzsche “knowingly” puts his ontological claims beyond the warrant of properly conceived and studied experience, hence they are “all the more hypothetical.” Furthermore, since Nietzsche’s thoughts are centered around these hypothetical ontological claims, he is still in line with previous metaphysical views. “Although he renounces the effort at a decisive, conceptual proof of these central claims, he still offers them as true in a sense . . . crucially continuous with the traditional one.”²⁴⁴

Richardson’s understanding of the will to power as an essence claim does not seem to be fair to Nietzsche’s understanding of the will to power and essence. As we know, Nietzsche claims that everything is will to power and everything is in a constant change. There is nothing stable and unchanging. Yet essence claims are about something unchanging and stable; i.e., about the *essence* of something. Then, Richardson’s claim is that Nietzsche’s doctrine of the will to power is about the unchanging essences of beings. If there is something unchanging, then it is not in the chaotic world of power quanta. This means that Nietzsche must be drawing the famous metaphysical distinction between the apparent and real world. However, this distinction is one of the main targets of Nietzsche’s attacks on metaphysics. As we will see in the following chapter, where Nietzsche’s perspectivism will be explained in detail, the rejection of this distinction is one of the main elements of his perspectivism. However, it is not only this distinction, on which Nietzsche’s rejection of the metaphysical conception of the essence is based. His rejection is directly related with perspectivism. According to Nietzsche, the essence of something is dynamically determined through the power struggle of power quanta. Every power quantum determines the essence of the others by evaluating and imposing

²⁴³ Richardson, p. 288.

²⁴⁴ Richardson, p. 289.

a meaning onto every other power quantum according to this evaluation. Hence, for Nietzsche,

[t]he question “what is that?” is an imposition of meaning from some other viewpoint. “Essence,” the “essential nature,” is something perspective and already presupposes a multiplicity. At the bottom of it there always lies “what is that for *me*?” (for us, for all that lives, etc.)

A thing would be defined once all creatures had asked “what is that?” and had answered their question. Supposing one single creature, with its own relationships and perspectives for all things were missing, then the thing would not yet be “defined.”²⁴⁵

Therefore, it is not possible to ascribe Nietzsche a metaphysics based on the claim that his will to power is an essence claim. Furthermore, Richardson’s use of Quine’s metaphor of the web of beliefs for providing a base for his claim about the ontology of the will to power does not work. For this approach is not different from a metaphysical base in their being stable and unchanging. That is, this approach also dismisses the dynamic structure of the doctrine of the will to power. Everything is always in a constant change, there is nothing stable to use as a firm basis in Nietzsche’s doctrine. However, the metaphor of the web still presupposes a world in stable order.

Consequently, neither Heidegger’s, nor Richardson’s claims are convincing and strong enough to regard Nietzsche as a metaphysical thinker. They both have missed something important about Nietzsche’s philosophy. His perspectivism is missed by these two great Nietzsche scholars. This is not the only similarity between them. Although they belong to different, if not directly opposite, traditions of philosophy, both Heidegger and Richardson follow the same route in their attempt to make Nietzsche a metaphysical thinker. First, of course, they both believe that Nietzsche is a metaphysician. Second, Heidegger and Richardson believe that being a metaphysician is good for Nietzsche. According to Heidegger, this makes Nietzsche a serious and genuine thinker whereas for Richardson it shows the greatness and richness of his thought. Third,

²⁴⁵ WP, §562, p. 303.

they both claim that metaphysics is ontology, that it speaks about the essence, or being, of things. Fourth one, related to the first, both Heidegger and Richardson, to reach their pre-established metaphysician Nietzsche projects, distort Nietzsche's thoughts and ignore perspectivism, which one of the most crucial aspects of his thoughts.

One of the most interesting results of these similarities is that Nietzsche's philosophy is compatible with, or a representation of, the chaotic world of power quanta, and with his perspectivism. Most of the Nietzsche scholars accept the unsystematic, even, sometimes self-contradictory, character of his works. This unsystematic character of Nietzsche's works is what makes them chaotic and very difficult to understand for those, who are used to think systematically as if the world has a systematic and static structure. Because Nietzsche thinks in terms of becoming; as he puts it, it is easier to think in terms of being than to think in terms of becoming: "The doctrine of being, of things, of all sorts of fixed unities is a hundred time easier than the doctrine of becoming, of development."²⁴⁶ Nietzsche's works are chaotic and inextricably complicated for those thinkers who work within the traditional static concept of truth and the world. Nietzsche, instead of imposing the character of being upon the world of becoming, chooses the difficult way and tries to comprehend the world as it is, as a world of becoming. Therefore, it is not possible to comprehend, or understand, Nietzsche's thought by traditional concepts; they are designed to express the world of being. As the structure of Nietzsche's works is similar to that of the chaotic world of power quanta and, for him, this world is not knowable but interpretable, then his works are also interpretable; there is no one stable meaning hidden behind their unsystematic structure. That is, his works has as many meanings as the numbers of the interpreters. My point may become more clear if we consider his definition of perspectivism: "In so far as the word 'knowledge' has any meaning, the world is knowable: but it is *interpretable* otherwise, it has no meaning behind it, but countless meanings.—

²⁴⁶ WP, §538, p. 291.

Perspectivism.”²⁴⁷ Although this definition seems to be implying relativism, as we will see in the next chapter, perspectivism has nothing to do with relativism.²⁴⁸ Hence, as this quotation implies, Heidegger’s and Richardson’s claims are only interpretations. As Nietzsche asserts “[i]t is our needs that interpret the world,”²⁴⁹ it is Heidegger’s and Richardson’s needs that interpret Nietzsche’s works. They both interpret Nietzsche as a metaphysical thinker, as their needs compel them to do so. At this point, the reason for their distortion of Nietzsche, ignoring of his perspectivism, and following the same route intersects and becomes clear. Although they have different philosophical backgrounds, they have reached the same conclusion by following similar routes, yet applying different methods of argumentation according to their philosophical backgrounds. They both have to present Nietzsche as a metaphysical thinker for their philosophical concerns. Consequently, I maintain that neither Heidegger’s nor Richardson’s attempts are convincing enough to prove that Nietzsche is a metaphysical thinker.

²⁴⁷ WP, §481, p. 267.

²⁴⁸ See, Chapter 3.4.

²⁴⁹ WP, §481, p. 267.

CHAPTER III

NIETZSCHE'S PERSPECTIVISM

In the preceding chapter, we have seen that Nietzsche presents us a world of ever-changing power quanta. This is a dynamic world, in which there is nothing stable. There is a continuous power struggle among these power quanta, and because of this struggle, everything is in a constant flux. To view the world as world of change is not a new idea; there are philosophers who see the world in which we live as the world of change. For example, Plato also views the world as the world of change; yet, for him, this world could not be the object of our knowledge. Plato puts another world against this changing world; namely the world of Ideas. This world is the real world and the world in which we live is false in the sense that the entities or individuals in this world are only imitations of the real entities in the world of ideas. For Plato, knowledge is that of the Ideas, hence the individuals in the world of change could not be the objects of our knowledge. Because, for him, knowledge must be universal and unchanging. Yet, universality could not come from the world of change; therefore, it must come from the world, in which there is no change.

However, Nietzsche rejects such a dualistic conception of the world and universal knowledge. For Nietzsche, there is no other world than this one, in which we live. If we have anything to do with the world, then we should do it without appealing to another metaphysical and true world. Then, our traditional concept of knowledge falls down. That is, if we have only a changing world, then there is no way to secure our beliefs or ideas about this world.

This elimination of the real world, or the rejection of the traditional distinction between the real and the apparent world, faces us with the question of attaining and securing knowledge. Here, Cartesian dualism seems to help us in securing our knowledge. However, Nietzsche also rejects the Cartesian

distinction between *res cogitans* and *res extensa*. That is, he rejects the Cartesian distinction between the knowing subject and the knowable object. Moreover, Nietzsche also rejects the Cartesian motto “*cogito ergo sum*,” by declaring the “phenomenality” of the self. That is, for Nietzsche, the self-awareness of the thinking subject, on which Descartes builds the edifice of knowledge, is as phenomenal as the awareness of the external world, which is rejected as the possibility of being a hallucination.

Nietzsche’s rejections are not limited only to apparent-real world, subject-object distinctions and the traditional conception of the self as the knowing or thinking subject. He also attacks other respected and reliable components of our cognitive paradigm, i.e., logic and causality. These rejections show us that Nietzsche is actually rejecting all of our trusted and honored cognitive tools and categories and our concept of truth, all of which presuppose a static and unchanging world order. Thus, our conception of knowledge and truth become susceptible on the face of these rejections.

However, by these rejections, Nietzsche does not claim that we cannot attain knowledge about the world in which we live. What he tries to do is that our conceptions of knowledge and truth are wrong or false on the ground that it assumes a static and unchanging world order and aims at universal and eternal truths, whereas there are no such things as stable world order and universal and eternal truths. Instead of these elemental assumptions of our cognitive paradigm, Nietzsche proposes a world, which is always changing and a notion of truth, which is always perspectival. In other words, instead of our traditional correspondence theory of truth, Nietzsche puts forward a perspectival theory of knowledge, namely “Perspectivism.”

Simply put, Nietzsche’s perspectivism is the claim that what we call true is a perspectival interpretation; accordingly, there is no absolute truth. There may be other simple definitions for the concept, yet this definition, in my opinion, is what Nietzsche really means by perspectivism, of course, in its simplest form. The idea of perspectivism is the core of Nietzsche’s epistemology and his denial of truth. Hence, it may not be wrong to call his epistemology as perspectival

epistemology, as Ruediger H. Grimm, Steven D. Hales and Rex Welshon did.²⁵⁰ This epistemology is mainly based on Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power, which portrays the world not as the world of being, but becoming.

Let us, now, explore Nietzsche's perspectivism through his rejections of the elemental categories and assumptions of our cognitive paradigm. However, before going into the details of these rejections, I want to briefly present Nietzsche's perspectivism in relation with his notion of the world as becoming and interpretation.

3.1 The World as Becoming

Nietzsche considers the world as becoming and rejects the traditional metaphysical conception of reality as consisting of changeless beings. As his doctrine of the will to power suggests, the world is not a stable and unchanging unity, rather it is in a constant flux, resulting from the power struggles of the quanta of power, which are simply wills to power. In short, Nietzsche replaces the "world of being" of the traditional Western metaphysics with the "world of becoming." This replacement leads to the core of his epistemology, namely *perspectivism*.

According to Nietzsche, the concept of being and the stable world are nothing but illusions. Because, in the world of power quanta, which is constantly in the process of becoming, there is no being, and to suppose that there are unchanging beings, or to regard the world as an ordered and stable unity, is nothing but an illusion created by us to preserve ourselves in this chaotic world. "[I]n a world there is no being," says Nietzsche, "a certain calculable world of *identical* cases first be created by *illusion*: a tempo in which observation and comparison are possible, etc."²⁵¹ That is, in order to prosper, we as humans have imposed such a world order on the chaotic world of power quanta: "Because we have to stable in our beliefs if we are to prosper, we have made the 'real' world a

²⁵⁰ See, Grimm, p. 61, and Steven D. Hales and Rex Welshon, *Nietzsche's Perspectivism*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000, p. 123.

²⁵¹ WLN, 14[93], p. 250.

world not of change and becoming, but one of being.”²⁵² After this imposition, the world had become knowable and predictable for us; the world of chaos had become a world of order with laws attainable by us. In other words, it becomes easier for us to live in this world of becoming; as Nietzsche puts it “[t]he doctrine of being, of things, of all sorts of fixed unities is a hundred times easier than the doctrine of becoming, of development.”²⁵³ Furthermore, since this illusory world representation is proven to be successful in maintaining our existence, we regard it as the real world; that is, the fiction that we created at the end becomes real or a reality for us. Hence, the conception of the world as an ordered and stable place to live in safely, which is calculable and formulatable for us, is an illusory world; this is “a trimmed and simplified world on which our *practical* instincts have worked,” and “[i]t suits *us* perfectly: we *live* in it, we can live in it—*proof* of its truth for us.”²⁵⁴ Let us examine the dynamic structure of the Nietzschean world of becoming, to see why our conception of the stable world is an illusion for Nietzsche.

As we know, the world, for Nietzsche, is will to power; everything that exists is either a quantum or a quanta of will to power. These power quanta are constantly in a struggle with each other for gaining more power. In order to extend their power collectively, they may constitute power constellations, in which, while they strive for furthering their power individually, they also strive for furthering the power of the constellation as a whole. Although these power constellations can be regarded as a unity of power quanta, this unity is not a homogenous one. Because every quantum of power still searches after gaining more power in and through this unity. In other words, although they constitute a unity for increasing their power collectively, every power quantum struggles with every other quantum for gaining more power. This constant lust for power is what they are; that is, these power quanta are primordially will to power. Hence, the world is constructed out of such dynamic power quanta, which are

²⁵² WP, §507, p. 276.

²⁵³ WP, §538, p. 291.

²⁵⁴ WLN, 14[93], p. 250.

connected in relation of power struggle. Every power quantum is determined through this power struggle. “Every quantum of power is designated by the effect it produces and that which it resists.”²⁵⁵

Thus, the constellations of these power quanta are not homogenous; a power constellation, as a unity of power quanta, is an organization similar to a human community or a political federation. “All unity is unity only as organization and co-operation—just as a human community is a unity—as opposed to an atomistic anarchy, as a pattern of domination that *signifies* a unity but it *is* not a unity.”²⁵⁶ Furthermore, a quantum of power or a constellation could increase its power only at the expense of others; it increases its power by assimilating, dominating and appropriating others. However, this does not mean that assimilated or incorporated power quantum ceases to exist; it is still a power quantum, and still searches for the ways to increase its power. Yet, in this encounter, both power centers change; their power increases or decreases. “It is a question of a struggle between two elements of unequal power: a new arrangement of forces is achieved according to the measure of power of each of them . . . the essential thing is that the factions in struggle emerge with different quanta of power.”²⁵⁷ The power struggle among the power centers does not stop at some level of power configuration; there is no point of equilibrium. The struggle continues forever. This struggle gives the world a dynamic character. The world or reality constructed out of such power centers is in a constant flux; hence, the world is not a world of being, but of becoming.

In this dynamic world of power centers, every power quantum is determined by its relations with every other quantum of power. Therefore, each one of these power quanta is experienced by every other differently; i.e., a power quantum may appear to be more powerful for one power quanta while for another one it appears to be weak. Hence, there is no a constant and unchanging reality which is experienced as the same by every power center. That is, every

²⁵⁵ WP, §634, pp. 337-38.

²⁵⁶ WP, §561, p. 303.

²⁵⁷ WP, §633, p. 337.

power center experiences the world differently in relation to its degree of power; since there is a constant struggle for power among these power centers, the world constantly changes, which means that the relations among power centers also change, and as we know that a power center is determined through its relations with every other power center, it changes, too. For Nietzsche, the reality is the totality of the actions and reactions of individual power centers on every other center in their struggle for power; “the ‘world’ is only a word for the totality of these actions. Reality consists precisely in this particular action and reaction of every individual part toward the whole.”²⁵⁸

According to Nietzsche, what we say about this ever-changing and dynamic world is necessarily false; that is, “The character of the world in a state of becoming as incapable of formulation, as ‘false,’ as ‘self-contradictory.’”²⁵⁹ What we say or think about the world immediately becomes false, since there is no stable order in the world to allow us to adequately comprehend and articulate the way in which it *is*. We do not have any adequate means of expression or conceptual scheme to comprehend and express this world of constant change. Hence, our knowledge of the world is necessarily “false,” not in the sense that there is a stable and unchanging world as the object of our knowledge and we have failed to comprehend it. Rather, it is in the sense that what we say or think about the world presupposes a true world, which is stable and unchanging, and this presupposition falsifies the world of becoming. What we as power centers do is to impose a regularity and order upon this chaotic world of becoming in order to increase our power. “Not ‘to know’ but to schematize—to impose upon chaos as much regularity and form as our practical needs require.”²⁶⁰

The world or reality is not something changeless, and it is not a stable and ordered unity; it is a chaos, created by the struggles of power centers. Every power center tries to construct a world beneficial for its well-being out of this chaotic world, and since every power center is different from each other, every

²⁵⁸ WP, §567, p. 305.

²⁵⁹ WP, §517, p. 280.

²⁶⁰ WP, §515, p. 278.

one of them experiences the world differently; hence, their construction of the world also differs from others. In short, every power center interprets the world from the perspective in which it can increase its power by dominating or assimilating others. Through interpretation, power centers construct a world, in which they could increase their power by dominating and assimilating the others. Actually, as Nietzsche says “interpretation is itself a means of becoming master of something.”²⁶¹ The concept of interpretation is another important constituent of Nietzsche’s perspectivism, let us, now, explore it.

3.2 Interpretation

As we see, for Nietzsche, our conception of the world, in which we could manage to survive, is an illusion created by us; it is our interpretation of the fluxing and chaotic world. The static and ordered notion of the world is nothing but an interpretation made by us from the perspective of preserving and increasing our power. Actually, to create a stable and calculable world is a vital necessity for organisms. “In order for a particular species to maintain itself and increase its power, its conception of reality must comprehend enough of the calculable and constant for it to base a scheme of behaviour on it.”²⁶² In this sense, interpretation becomes a way of mastering others. That is, as highly complex forms of will to power, or power center, we human beings arrange and organize the world according to the requirements of increasing our power. Hence, as Nietzsche says, “[i]t is our needs that interpret the world.”²⁶³ However, ignoring this fact, we treat this illusion as the reality, or the state in which the world is. We base all of our beliefs and values on this illusory world conception, insofar as it works, or satisfy our needs, which are the products of our striving for more power. Nietzsche’s perspectivism aims at showing us the illusory character of our conception of the world and destructing our cognitive and axiological paradigms grounded on this illusion.

²⁶¹ WP, §643, p. 342.

²⁶² WP, §480, p. 266.

²⁶³ WP, §481, p. 267.

As this illusory conception of the world facilitates our survival and prosperity, it becomes real for us. We try to understand and comprehend this world, ignoring, even forgetting, its illusory or interpretative character. Our cognitive apparatus operates within the limits of this world. Hence, our knowledge and beliefs are about this limited and illusory world. Everything that we regard as true is nothing but an illusion in the sense that it is valued according to an illusory world. In other words, our knowledge claims are verified with regard to the facts of this illusory world; the claims about this illusory world are verified by applying again to the facts of this world. This is what Nietzsche means when he says the following: “Ultimately, man finds in things nothing but what he himself has imported into them: the finding is called science, the importing—art, religion, love, pride.”²⁶⁴ Thus, we create an illusory reality out of a chaotic world by interpreting it from the perspective of our survival and prosperity. Yet, we also cast the facts of this illusory world, which are also interpretations, as our criterion of truth. This makes our conception of truth, which designates truth as universal and valid in all cases, becomes questionable. For this conception of truth is based on an interpretation which, denying the ever-changing character of the world, designates a well-ordered and stable world. Nietzsche, on this basis, denies truth:

The world with which we are concerned is false, i.e., is not a fact but a fable and approximation on the basis of a meager sum of observations; it is “in flux,” as something in a state of becoming, as falsehood always changing but never getting near the truth: for—there is no “truth.”²⁶⁵

Nietzsche’s denial of the stable world order and the conception of truth based on this order are found on his doctrine of the will to power. Instead of our traditional conception of the world as the world of being, Nietzsche offers a chaotic world of power quanta, in which process of becoming continues. This conception of the world undermines our traditional conception of truth as correspondence to facts. That is, in the world of becoming, truth as

²⁶⁴ WP, §606, p. 327.

²⁶⁵ WP, §616, p. 330.

correspondence does not work, as there is nothing stable in this world for any claim or statement to correspond. Therefore, there is no truth; all our truths are false and illusory. This means that we require another conception and criterion of truth. We will discuss Nietzsche's notion and denial of truth later, but, for now, we can say that as the world is in a state of flux and continuously changing, all of our ideas, beliefs, values, etc., are only interpretations of this world, hence their truth depends on their contribution to increase our power. That is, if any belief or idea enhances my power it is true, otherwise, if it decreases my power, it is false.

Well, for Nietzsche the world is an interpretation, yet what does Nietzsche mean by interpretation? To what kind of a process does Nietzsche refer, when he speaks of interpretation? Let us now focus on the nature of the process of interpretation.

In its everyday use, the term implies an intellectual or armchair activity. However, as we know that, for Nietzsche, everything is will to power and every power center tries to increase its power, even at the expense of its life. Therefore, Nietzsche's notion of interpretation could not be a passive process as in the case of interpreting books, works of art, etc. Grimm gives us a clue for understanding interpretation, in Nietzsche's sense, by saying that ". . . interpretative process is not an 'armchair adventure,' nor is it 'merely' imaginative. It is to be taken as a literal structuring and ordering of the world on the part of the individual."²⁶⁶ Then, the interpretation is the process, in which a power center, as a will to power, actively shapes, arranges, assimilates and determines the world to create the conditions of its preservation and enhancement.

The interpretative process is not something peculiar to man; every organism, from the most simple to the most complex, interprets the world; "[t]he organic process constantly presupposes interpretations."²⁶⁷ Every organic being interprets its neighborhood or surroundings to increase its power, and all its organic functions are directed to this end. As we saw earlier, in our discussion of Darwinism, Nietzsche sees the construction of an organ not as a question of

²⁶⁶ Grimm, p. 70.

²⁶⁷ WP, §643, p. 342.

adaptation but of interpretation. That is, an organ is constructed not for helping the organism in its adaptation to the environing conditions, but for helping it in interpreting those conditions and enhancing its power through interpretation. Hence, for Nietzsche, an amoeba's extends pseudopodia* for increasing its power by interpreting its environment. "The will to power can manifest itself only against resistances; therefore it seeks that which resists it—this is the primeval tendency of the protoplasm when it extends pseudopodia and feels about."²⁶⁸ With pseudopodia, an amoeba interprets and structures its environment; it structures its world by distinguishing the edible from inedible entities, or organisms.²⁶⁹ Thus, the organic process, in a sense, is a process of interpretation. In other words, interpretation is of vital importance for life. As Nietzsche's above quoted note suggests, the organic process maintains itself by continuously interpreting its environment.

Every interpretation, as a power struggle, results in an increase or decrease of power on the part of the power centers, involved in the process. This increase or decrease of power implies a change in the environment. That is, through the process of interpretation, both the interpreter and the interpreted change; one gets more powerful and the other gets weaker. As a result of these changes in their degree of power, both parties interpret each other differently; their valuations concerning each other changes; hence, a new interpretation is

* A pseudopodia or pseudopodium is the "processes temporarily formed by protrusion of any part of the protoplasm of the body, and serving for locomotion, prehension, or ingestion of food." "Pseudopodium," *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., CD-ROM, version 1.14, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

²⁶⁸ WP, §656, p. 345.

²⁶⁹ To explain how an amoeba would interpret and structures its world, Grimm tries to look the world from the perspective of an amoeba. According to him, the world of an amoeba would consist of two types of entities; beneficial and detrimental, or edible and inedible ones. This distinction both has a vital importance for an amoeba, and it is the only distinction that an amoeba is capable of making. Hence, the world of an amoeba is a very simple one, in which there are only edible and inedible entities. Other qualities, that any other complex organisms are able to discern, do not exist in its world. As Grimm says "[f]rom its perspective, the amoeba interprets away any and all differences between the entities which it encounters. Color, noise, odor, etc. do not exist for the amoeba, because the only quality in which it is interested is edibility." (Grimm, p. 71.) Comparing it with our complex view of the world, Grimm says that the amoeba's world is false. However, this falsification of the world is necessary for an amoeba, "which might very well starve if it were suddenly forced to make the distinctions which we make between the various forms of microscopic life." (Grimm, p. 71.)

required. Nietzsche explains this circularity of interpretation as follows; “all events in the organic world are a subduing, a *becoming master*, and all subduing and becoming master involves a fresh interpretation, an adaptation through which any previous ‘meaning’ and ‘purpose’ are necessarily obscured or even obliterated.”²⁷⁰

Our usual understanding of the concept suggests that if there is an interpretation, then there must be an interpreter. However, Nietzsche rejects the notion of an interpreter behind interpretation. Because, for him, this leads us to the subject-object distinction. As we know he rejects the distinction between the doer and the deed; there is no a separate entity as the agent of a deed. For him, a thing or an entity is totality of what it does, and every existing entity, whether organic or inorganic, is will to power; hence, it is the will to power that interprets. In other words, interpretation is a form of the will to power: “One may not ask: ‘who then interprets?’ for the interpretation itself is a form of the will to power, exists (but not as a ‘being’ but as a process, a becoming) as an affect.”²⁷¹ Moreover, after such a separation there remains nothing in the world. That is, for Nietzsche, everything exists through its activities and relations, and if we think it as an entity independent of these activities and relations there remains nothing but a fiction: “If I remove all the relationships, all the ‘properties,’ all the ‘activities,’ of a thing, the thing does not remain over.”²⁷² Therefore, one cannot separate doer from the deed, or *vice versa*.

Other than the above presented problems, placing an interpreter behind the interpretation leads to understanding Nietzsche’s concept of interpretation as a subjective valuation. That is, to contemplate that the world is composed of subjects that interprets and the objects that are interpreted, and to understand Nietzsche’s concept of interpretation through this world picture may lead one to the conclusion that by interpretation Nietzsche means that “everything is

²⁷⁰ GM, II, §12, p. 77.

²⁷¹ WP, §556, p. 302.

²⁷² WP, §558, p. 302.

subjective.” However, Nietzsche is strongly opposed to such a conclusion, and regards it as an interpretation, of course in his own sense.

“Everything subjective” you say; but even this is interpretation. The “subject” is not something given, it is something added and invented and projected behind what there is.—Finally, is it necessary to posit an interpreter behind the interpretation? Even this is invention, hypothesis.²⁷³

To interpret is to create a reality, in which the organism manages to preserve itself and increase its power, out of the chaotic world; it is the process of simplifying that chaos. Through interpretation, a power center imposes meaning over this chaotic reality. However, imposition of meaning does not amount to explaining or attaining knowledge of the reality: “‘Interpretation,’ the introduction of meaning—‘not explanation’ (in most cases a new interpretation over an old interpretation that has become incomprehensible, that is now itself only a sign).”²⁷⁴ The meanings imposed by power centers are fictions, which make the world a stable and ordered unity. However, these fictions have nothing to do with the chaotic reality in which every power center struggles for power with every other center. That is, they create an illusory reality for themselves to increase their power. These illusory fictions, as far as they contribute to the welfare of the power center, become indispensable for it.

According to Nietzsche, most of our beliefs are such fictions or falsifications. For example, our belief in causality, subject-object distinction, moral values, etc., are such useful fictions, whose utility for us in maintaining ourselves and in increasing our power proved. The truth of these beliefs is dependent on their utility, not on their correspondence to the reality; if believing and constructing our life on them contributes to enhance our power, they are true, otherwise they are not. When their utility is proven, our beliefs, although they are false or illusions in the sense that they do not correspond to the world or reality, become indispensable truths for us. Nietzsche emphasizes the indispensability of these fictions when he says that “[t]ruth is the kind of error

²⁷³ WP, §481, p. 267.

²⁷⁴ WP, §604, p. 327.

without which a certain species of life could not live. The value for *life* is ultimately decisive.”²⁷⁵

In sum, interpretation is a continuous process, in which a power center tries to organize, assimilate its environment to increase and preserve its power. It is a form of will to power, a form in which will to power exerts itself over other power centers, therefore it is not something, whose agent is a power center. A power center is just this process of interpretation. Through interpretation, a power center creates a world beneficial for its prosperity and for the enhancement of its power out of a chaotic world of becoming. Hence, in this sense, the process of interpretation is the process, in which a well-ordered and stable world is illusorily constructed out of the world of becoming by shaping, arranging and ordering this chaotic world. Furthermore, if, or when, these illusions are proven to be successful in enhancing life and power of interpreting power centers, then they become an indispensable part of their life.

The construction of the world as becoming and the concept of interpretation are keys for better understanding of Nietzsche’s perspectivism. There is a strong relation between the world of becoming and concept of interpretation. Breaking the traditional conception of the world through becoming, Nietzsche makes room for his notion interpretation, which leads to his epistemological standpoint, namely perspectivism. Let us, now, try to explore his notion perspectivism with these keys in our hands.

3.3 Perspectivism

Perspectivism is Nietzsche’s alternative to our traditional concept of epistemology. He tries to develop a new understanding of epistemology based on his doctrine of the will to power and interpretation. He mentions perspectivism as one of his fundamental innovations, and explains this innovation by saying “[i]n place of ‘epistemology,’ a perspective theory of affects.”²⁷⁶ Actually, it is not so easy to decide whether Nietzsche’s perspectivism is an alternative to our

²⁷⁵ WP, §493, p. 272.

²⁷⁶ WP, §462, p. 255.

cognitive paradigm or it is an explanation of the way, in which our cognitive paradigm is constructed. Because, his criticisms of the most honored and trusted assumptions and concepts of our traditional epistemological paradigm seem to be aimed at showing their perspectival and interpretative characters. In other words, perspectivism could be seen as an alternative way to evaluate our cognitive paradigm by showing its hidden origin; i.e., by showing its denial of the ever-changing character of reality. This uncovering of the veil of the hidden roots of our cognitive paradigm also amounts to destroying that paradigm. As at its origin this paradigm rejects the notion of the ever-changing reality, which is, for Nietzsche, the actual state of the reality, all of its honored and trusted concepts, assumptions and truths are illusions; they have nothing to do with the actual world. Hence, in this sense, Nietzsche's perspectivism is both an alternative to our cognitive paradigm²⁷⁷ and an explanation of its origin. Let us now have a closer look at Nietzsche's perspectivism under the light of this dual character of perspectivism.

By the doctrine of perspectivism, Nietzsche aims at destroying our cognitive paradigm, based on a stable and knowable world order, which includes such traditional concepts and distinctions as subject and object, apparent and real world, causality, thing-in-itself, logic, etc. Nietzsche always rejected these concepts and distinctions of the traditional Western metaphysics. Perspectivism, thus, is Nietzsche's attempt to destroy this metaphysics by undermining its epistemological and ontological foundations. However, there is no clear definition or explanation of perspectivism in Nietzsche's neither published nor

²⁷⁷ Schrift makes a similar point by saying that perspectivism is not an ontological theory. According to him, "Nietzsche's remarks concerning perspectives delineate a position whose domain is 'epistemic' rather than 'ontological.'" However, for Schrift, this does not mean that by perspectivism Nietzsche is proposing an epistemological theory "in the restricted sense of providing a 'theory of *knowledge*.'" Here, the term epistemic indicates, for Schrift, that Nietzsche's perspectivism is not concerned with ontological questions. "Instead, the designation as 'epistemic' means to imply that the perspectival account concerns what we can 'know' and not what there 'is.'" Hence, Nietzsche's perspectivism is neither an ontological nor an epistemological theory, in the strict sense of these words. Rather, for Schrift, it is a rhetorical strategy, offering an alternative not to our traditional cognitive paradigm, but to its origin and the conceptual framework. "In other words, Nietzsche's perspectival account does not provide a theory at all; it is a rhetorical strategy that offers an alternative to the traditional epistemological conception of knowledge as the possession of some stable, eternal 'entities,' whether these be considered 'truths,' 'facts,' 'meanings,' 'propositions,' or whatever." (Schrift, p. 145.)

unpublished books and notes. Besides, there are only a few occurrences of the word perspectivism. The most clear definition of perspectivism is the well known passage from *Genealogy of Morals*:

[L]et us be on guard against the dangerous old conceptual fiction that posited a “pure, will-less, painless, timeless knowing subject”; let us guard against the snares of such contradictory concepts as “pure reason,” “absolute spirituality,” “knowledge in itself”: these always demand that we should think of an eye that is completely unthinkable, an eye turned in no particular direction, in which the active interpreting forces, through which alone seeing becomes seeing *something*, are supposed to be lacking; these always demand of the eye an absurdity and a nonsense. There is *only* a perspective seeing, *only* a perspective “knowing”; and the *more* affects we allow to speak about one thing, the *more* eyes, different eyes, we can use to observe one thing, the more complete will our “concept” of this thing, our “objectivity,” be. But to eliminate the will together, to suspend each and every affect, supposing we were capable of this—what would that mean but to *castrate* the intellect?²⁷⁸

As these words make it clear, Nietzsche accuses of traditional Western epistemological paradigm of adopting a God’s eye perspective towards the world. It tries to understand the world through a static perspective, which includes the denial of the active perspective setting and interpreting forces, i.e., will to power. To adopt such a perspective toward the world, for Nietzsche, is absurdity and nonsense, because it requires a knowing subject, which is so pure that there is no inherent aim in its cognitive efforts to know or to understand the world. The subject of knowledge, thus purified from all aims, wills, pains, etc., looks toward the world with an eye like that of God, to whom the world is in a determined order. For Nietzsche, both such a subject and a world is nonsense, because both of them are will to power, which has an essential aim of increasing its power. In other words, the knowing subject, as will to power or power center, actively interprets the world from the perspective of its own growth, and the world is a chaos consisting of such power centers, and as such it is always in a

²⁷⁸ GM, III, §12, p. 119.

constant flux. Therefore, every power center sees and knows the world through its perspective.

Actually, for a power center the world is nothing but the totality of the interpretations made by it through its perspective adopted towards the every other power center. “Every center of force adopts a perspective toward the entire remainder, i.e., its own particular valuation, mode of action, and mode of resistance.”²⁷⁹ For Nietzsche, as we saw earlier, the world and reality are nothing but the totality of these perspectives, or valuations, actions, resistance, etc. Because of this, Nietzsche claims that we could have only a perspectival knowledge about a thing. That is, when we ask the question “what is that?” we are actually asking the question “what is that for me?” Because, as Nietzsche puts it, before a thing or a fact have become the object of the question “what is that?” “[t]here are no ‘facts-in-themselves,’ for a sense must always be projected into them before there can be ‘facts.’”²⁸⁰ Only then, a thing or a fact appears for us as a thing or a fact, which could bear a meaning for us. In other words, somehow, a thing, a fact, etc., must become a something for us to question its meaning; in short, it must be something affecting us in our struggle for power. What we actually do when we ask “what is that?” is that we are interpreting it from our perspective of increasing our power; what it could be for me in my struggle for power, or how it could affect my struggle. Thus, our initial question becomes ‘what is that for me?’; or as Nietzsche says “[a]t bottom of it there always lies ‘what is that for me?’ (for us, for all that lives, etc.)”²⁸¹ Since that fact or something we are questioning is also a will to power, or a power center, as we are, it too questions us through the same perspectival interpretation process. Hence, the world is nothing but the totality of these interpretations; it is determined by the perspectival interpretations of each power center adopted towards the entire remainder. Then, a thing is also the totality of the interpretations made by all other power centers through their own perspective

²⁷⁹ WP §567, p. 305.

²⁸⁰ WP §556, p. 301.

²⁸¹ WP §556, p. 301.

about it. Nietzsche says that “[a] thing would be defined once all creatures had asked ‘what is that?’ and had answered their question. Supposing one single creature, with its own relationships and perspectives for all things, were missing, then the thing would not yet be ‘defined.’”²⁸² Therefore, the world is the product of actively interpreting power centers, which are interconnected with each other by the power struggle. In such a world, every power center determines and is determined by every other power center. However, since in their struggle for power, they continuously change, i.e., one’s power may increase or decrease through this struggle, interpretations and perspectives also change. That is, every change in the degree of power of a power center results in a change in its perspective towards the remainder of the world, which requires new interpretations. Since the world is a limited amount of force, and any power increase can occur at the expense of others’ power, any change affects the relations among all power centers, which brings the character of constant flux into the world. Thus, the world and our perspectival interpretations concerning it are always changing, and neither the world nor our interpretations can be true in the sense that there is a correspondence between the two.

According to Nietzsche, every increase of power is an overcoming of narrower interpretations, and this overcoming enlarges the perspective or the horizon of the power centers. If an interpretation of the world is proven to be successful, then the power of the interpreting power center increases; actually, this increase is the condition of the success of the interpretation. This increase changes the perspective, or viewpoint, of the power center, and from its new perspective it interprets the world again. This new interpretation is more comprehensive than the previous one; it overcomes the older and narrower interpretation, and opens up new perspectives and horizons. Every power increase brings such a re-interpretation of the world and the overcoming of old interpretations. Nietzsche presents this interpretation process as the idea which permeates his writings: “every elevation of man brings with it the overcoming of narrower interpretations . . . every strengthening and increase of power opens up

²⁸² WP §556, pp. 301-2.

new perspectives and means believing in new horizons—this idea permeates my writings.”²⁸³

Consequently, the stable and changeless conception of the world, on which the Western metaphysics and epistemology depends, is only an interpretation made from the perspective of preservation and enhancement. This perspectival interpretation falsifies the world; that is, it creates a fictitious world by imposing an order upon the chaotic world of power quanta. Because of its utility and success in preservation and enhancement of mankind, this interpretation of the world has become an unchanging and universal truth. Upon this truth other useful falsifications are constructed, i.e., logic, causality, subject-object and apparent-real world distinctions. According to Nietzsche, these are only perspectival interpretations, or falsifications, of the world, and nothing else. To make Nietzsche’s point more clear, I will briefly examine his attacks on these subsequent falsifications. However, before proceeding on these falsifications, I will analyze the relation between Nietzsche’s perspectivism and relativism. Because, if perspectivism is accepted as a version of relativism, then the Nietzschean claim that the concepts and distinctions, on which the Western epistemological paradigm is depended, are only perspectival falsifications becomes meaningless.

3.4 Nietzsche’s Perspectivism and Relativism

Perspectivism, at first sight, gives the impression of relativism. However, this impression changes as soon as we take into consideration some of the main claims of Nietzsche’s perspectivism; i.e., his denial of objective reality, truth as correspondence, subject-object distinction, etc.

It should be noted that Nietzsche’s view is not that there is an objective reality or world, and every power center sees or knows this reality from its own perspective. This would amount to relativism, which is simply the view that a belief or a judgment about the world may be true for an individual or a group while it is false for some other individuals or groups. Nietzsche is aware of the

²⁸³ WP §616, p. 330.

danger of the possibility of confusing his perspectivism with relativism. Hence, he plainly draws the difference between his perspectivism and relativism in the following passage, where he discusses the perspectival character of the apparent world: “The perspective therefore decides the character of ‘appearance’! As if a world would still remain over after one deducted the perspective! By doing that one would deduct relativity.”²⁸⁴ It seems very clear that Nietzsche regards his perspectivism as different from the relativism. Yet, this quoted passage may not be sufficient to ensure that perspectivism is not a kind of relativism; therefore, we should investigate and present the differences between them.

Relativist position holds that there is an objective reality and our judgments are about this reality, and our judgments about it may be different, even conflicting, because of the differences in our cultural, psychological, social, and even genetic backgrounds; hence all of these different judgments are equally true. That is, for relativistic position, there is an objective reality out there and we know or see that reality from our point of view. Yet, there is also an absolute viewpoint from which that reality could be seen as it is, as independent of all the viewpoints of the subjects. This absolute viewpoint is not attainable, because if it were attainable, then the relativistic claim would fail. In other words, if that point is attainable then we have a criterion for evaluating the truth-value of the judgments; i.e., we have criterion for saying that a judgment is true or false compared with the judgment made from that absolute viewpoint. Therefore, relativistic position depends on the beliefs that there is an objective reality and that there is an absolute viewpoint, although it is unattainable, from which this reality could be known.²⁸⁵

This unattainable, yet, at least, imaginarily existing, point makes the relativist claim that all judgments are relatively true; i.e., true from the standpoint

²⁸⁴ WP, §567, p. 305.

²⁸⁵ As Babich emphasizes, “[r]elativists know very well what it would mean for something to be true in an absolute sense, because they depend upon that insight for their own justification. What they dispute—and it is this disputation that defines relativism—is how human, that is, historically and circumstantially limited judgment, is ultimately to be evaluated as an adequate expression of what really is the case.” (Babette E. Babich, *Nietzsche’s Philosophy Science: Reflecting Science on the Ground of Art and Life*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994, p. 51.)

of the subject making that judgment about the objective reality. Hence, for relativism, all of our judgments are always equal; they are relatively true, compared with the judgment made from the absolute viewpoint. Relativism does not make a differentiation, or gradation, among our judgments; none of our judgments has a privileged status. However, for Nietzsche, some interpretations, which diminish or deny life, i.e., the Christian interpretation of the world, are bad and some others, which enhances and affirms life, i.e., his own perspectivism, are good. This is one of the two crucial differences that Babich sees between relativism and Nietzsche's perspectivism. She puts this difference in the following way:

Rather than the perspectival claim that there is no truth, which given perspectivalist standard always entails that some non-truths (interpretations) are better than others (art, illusion, deception, and delusion), the implicit claim of relativism is that there is a truth above all positions to which no particular position has any privileged claim.²⁸⁶

However, in Nietzsche's perspectivism, there is no objective reality; i.e., there are no static entities or events in the world, on which we may have conflicting or differing judgments. As the agent of the judgment, the subject continuously interprets every entity in its environment; the subject is also interpreted by those, which it interprets. This continuous process of interpretation brings a continuous change on the both sides of the process: that is, in the process of interpretation both the interpreter and the interpreted are in a state of continuous change. It is this constant change that results in the conflicts and differences among the judgments of different individuals or groups. In other words, it is not the different cultural backgrounds of the interpreters that cause

²⁸⁶ Babich, *Nietzsche's Philosophy Science*, p. 49. Because of the relativist implications of the term perspectivism, Babich uses the term perspectivalism to refer to Nietzsche's perspectivism. She states her aim in choosing the term perspectivalism in the following way: "By using word perspectivalism, my purpose is to distinguish Nietzsche's philosophical reading of the ontological, aesthetico-epistemological implications of 'position,' 'point of view,' 'perspective' from the crypto-relativism of the mere endorsement or repetition of perspectives as such (*perspectivism*), I employ the *adjectival* noun form of *perspectivalism* in an attempt to avoid the relativistic confusion inherent in the word *perspectivism*." (*Ibid.*, p. 46.)

the differences among their judgments about the world, yet it is constant change that occurs on the parts of both the judge and the judged.

The second crucial point of difference between the relativism and perspectivism of Nietzsche is the irrationalism in his declaration that there are no facts but only interpretations: “facts is precisely what there is not, only interpretations.”²⁸⁷ This declaration leads to a self-contradiction on the part of Nietzsche; if there is no fact then is it a fact that there is no fact? Or, in the most known version of this self-contradiction, if there is no truth then this denial of truth is either true, in which case there is at least one truth that ‘there is no truth’, and this leads a deadly self-contradiction, or false, in which case there is nothing special about the claim to take it seriously. Then, the truth of Nietzsche’s claim implies, at the same time, its falseness; as soon as it is accepted as true, it becomes false. This self-contradiction is the very point on which most of the criticisms of Nietzsche’s perspectivism is based.²⁸⁸ However, Nietzsche is well aware of this contradiction, and he happily accepts and affirms this self-contradiction.

The wisest man would be the one richest in contradictions, who has, as it were, antennae for all types of men—as well as his great moments of grand harmony—a rare accident even in us!²⁸⁹

The subjective compulsion not to contradict here is a biological compulsion . . . Not being able to contradict is proof of an incapacity, not for “truth.”²⁹⁰

We are unable to affirm and to deny one and the same thing: this is a subjective empirical law, not the expression of any “necessity” but only of an inability.²⁹¹

Contradiction, actually, means being in conflict, or rejecting the traditional and other established ways of thinking. Behind Nietzsche’s praising

²⁸⁷ WP §481, p. 267.

²⁸⁸ Maudemarie Clark names this as the “problem of self-reference.” (Clark, p. 3.)

²⁸⁹ WP §259, p. 150.

²⁹⁰ WP §515, pp. 278-79.

²⁹¹ WP §516, p. 279.

of contradiction, there lies his rejection of rational, logical thought. Contradiction is a deficiency for those who assume a stable and unchanging world order. On the other hand, for those who contemplate the world as a chaos it is a virtue and richness of thought. Therefore, Nietzsche's claim that "there is no fact but only interpretations" or that "there is no truth" is a deficient, or a bad and ill-constituted way of thinking for those who clings to rational, or logical, thought as the correct way of thinking. However, Nietzsche rejects logic and logical thought, as they presuppose a static and well-ordered reality. Moreover, Nietzsche's denial of truth and the truth of this denial seem to be consistent with each other. Nietzsche denies the existence of absolute and unchanging truths; yet, if we remember his criterion of truth, we can speak of truths as long as they increase our power. If any belief, accepted as true, starts to decrease our power it becomes false; or any belief increasing my power is true for me, whereas, at the same time, for another individual that belief, decreasing his or her power, may be false. In short, as Nietzsche's criterion for truth does not include the principle of non-contradiction, to judge his perspectivism and his denial truth in terms of that principle is not a good way of evaluation. Because, for example, a statement or a belief, according to Nietzsche's criterion of truth, may be both true and false at the same time for different individuals, even, it may also be true at one time and false at another time for the same individual. Therefore, the claim that Nietzsche's denial of truth is a self-contradiction does not diminish its significance and importance.

On the other hand, relativism assumes rational thought; that is, the relativist position believes that there is an objective reality out there, and this reality could be known from an absolute point. This absolute point is not attainable, or achievable by individuals, yet this secures the existence of truth in the correspondence sense. In other words, relativism does not deny the existence of an well-ordered and unchanging world, and believes that, at least in principle, this world could be seen and known as it is from a point of view that does not intervened by the human conditions of existence, i.e., cultural backgrounds, desires, etc. Hence, relativism, in opposition to perspectivism, designates a

rational world-view, in which truth, at least in principle, could be attainable. Yet, these differences do not prevent some scholars to accuse Nietzsche's perspectivism as being a relativist view. One of the interesting claims of relativism concerning Nietzsche's perspectivism comes from Peter Poellner.

Poellner claims that because of the doctrine of the will to power Nietzsche's perspectivism could not escape from the charge of being a version of relativism. Poellner's claim does not seem to be based on a good analysis of the doctrine of the will to power. According to him, Nietzsche appeals to the doctrine of the will to power for analyzing the objective reality. This analysis, for Poellner, is based on "the representational contents and the interests (desires, values) of 'subjects.'"²⁹² Yet, this understanding of Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power is unacceptable. Because Nietzsche is against the notion of the objective reality and the notion of a knowing subject; we will see the details of his rejection of these two notions in the remainder of this chapter. Poellner, taking Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power as proposing an objective reality and a knowing subject, goes on to say that there may be subjects of knowledge with different interests, who experience the objective world so different from each other that everyone of them lives in different worlds. In other words, for Poellner, Nietzsche's doctrine allows us to say that every individual, having different interests, experiences the world differently from every other individual so that we may say that every individual lives in a unique world of his own. Therefore, according to Poellner, some judgments concerning the objective reality might be true for some such subjects yet false for others. However, Poellner avers that the individual, to whom we refer when we speak of relativism, is the human subject of everyday discourse. That is, by the term individual we refer to independent subjects that experience the world as we experience it; i.e., as affected by the same spatio-temporal objects in a similar way, in which we are affected. This definition of the individual, for Poellner, prevents us from saying that most of the judgments concerning objective reality may be true for some individuals and false for some others. This means that our

²⁹² Poellner, p. 292.

judgments about the objective world have the same truth-values insofar as we are ordinary, or normal, human beings. Thus, for Poellner, even if we accept Nietzsche's construction of the world as will to power, the situation does not change concerning our judgments about the objective world. "If and in so far as this is what we mean by 'individual', it is obviously not the case, even on Nietzschean premises, that 'many judgments about objective reality may be true for one individual and false for another.'"²⁹³ Hence concerning the objective reality there could not arise relativism, even if it is constructed out of Nietzsche's will to power. Accepting this conclusion, Poellner changes the direction of his questioning about the relativism inherent in Nietzsche's perspectivism, and starts to question Nietzsche's construction of the subject of perspectivism.

As we have seen, relativism about the objective world is dismissed by Poellner, on the condition that individuals are normal human beings and there is an objective reality out there independent of the judging individuals, even if this reality is constructed out of dynamic power quanta. However, when we turn to Nietzsche's construction of the subject and his explanations of subject's operations, there arises certain problems: either Nietzsche's perspectivism is a kind of relativism or what he claims through perspectivism is false. If perspectivism is true, then Nietzsche's explanation of how individuals perceive the world, or how their perspectival construction of the world take place, may be false for them from their own perspective. In Poellner's words, Nietzsche's "own construal of the *modus operandi* of those other subjects may actually be false from their point of view or perspective."²⁹⁴ Actually, for Poellner, it is impossible for a subject, who has the degree of self-awareness required for expressing this awareness in clear judgments, to accept Nietzsche's analysis of his or her perception and construction of the world from his or her own perspective unless the subject in question alters his or her character so that Nietzsche's analysis appears to be true. However, even if this is the case, i.e., Nietzsche's analysis is true, Poellner claims, it is not a clear explanation. For

²⁹³ Poellner, p. 292.

²⁹⁴ Poellner, p. 293.

Poellner, because Nietzsche's explanation depends upon the subjective and inaccessible states, what Nietzsche says about those states is only a mystical fable. That is, as these states are subjective and inaccessible, therefore they cannot be further analyzed in behaviorist and physicalist terms. Consequently, "it is simply mysterious what could be meant by saying that these perspectival states, *qua* perspectival states, have a certain specific character without this character being recognizable from within the perspective in question."²⁹⁵ From this argumentation, Poellner concludes that either Nietzsche's explanation of the perspectives of other subjects is relatively true or it is false. That is, the only possibility for saving Nietzsche's perspectivism from falling into the relativism is to claim that perspectivism is false.

However, as I have stated above, Poellner's argument is completely dependent on a misleading analysis of Nietzsche's construction of the world as will to power. Poellner's claim is based on a distinction between the object and the subject. Yet, Nietzsche ceaselessly rejects this distinction, and claims that everything is will to power. Actually, Poellner is well aware of this fact, yet this awareness does not prevent his consciously ignoring it by claiming that Nietzsche's application of the perspectivism to the subjective states is wrong. He says

it is one thing to maintain that what counts as a real object is dependent on the interest and values of the subject(s) to whom it is, as he puts it, of 'concern'; it is quite another thing to say that the character of another's subjective states—whose existence one recognizes—is logically dependent in this manner on an external interpreter's interpretive stance.²⁹⁶

What Poellner doing here is nothing but to show his strong fidelity to the subject object distinction. That is, he could not accept Nietzsche's denial of the distinction. He still clings to the distinction when he tries to reject Nietzsche's perspectivism and his denial of the distinction. At the root of his objection to Nietzsche's perspectivism, especially in the domain of human individuals, there

²⁹⁵ Poellner, p. 293.

²⁹⁶ Poellner, pp. 293-94.

lies the belief that, at least, the cognitive states, or subjective states, are different from the nature of those entities that we call as real objects. In other words, for Poellner, the nature of the real objects and the nature of the human individuals are different, and the doctrine of the will to power and perspectivism does not work in explaining the nature of human individual. Poellner, thus, gives to the human individual and to the processes or states that take place in that individual a special position compared with the real objects. This shows us Poellner's strong belief that there must be some difference between the subject and object, and his rejection of Nietzsche's denial of the distinction between the two depends merely on this belief. I think rejecting someone's thought simply by saying that "I believe that it is wrong" or by saying "there must be distinction between the subject and the object, for I believe that distinction" is not a good way of refuting a thought. Babich regards such attempts at criticizing Nietzsche as spoiling the game by changing the rules. She says that "[w]hen one plays by the enemy's rule (Nietzsche's perspectivalism) one cannot of a sudden change the rules (to a nonperspectival order of articulate expression) in order to claim a triumph."²⁹⁷ Actually, most of the criticisms of Nietzsche's thoughts suffer from such sudden change of the rules. Poellner's claim too commits a sudden change of the rules. Furthermore, such approaches as Poellner's make it difficult, if not impossible, to catch Nietzsche's point. That is, because of this belief, Poellner misses the crucial and subtle points of Nietzsche's thought.

As Poellner accepts and as we frequently see, Nietzsche does not make a distinction between the subject and the object. For him, there is only will to power and nothing else. Nietzsche's construction of the world as the world of becoming, as the world of the dynamic power quanta, continuously struggling for more power, is the root of his perspectivism. Trying to analyze his perspectivism by ignoring its root leads us to the conclusions that have nothing to do with Nietzsche's perspectivism. That is, if you ignore Nietzsche's construction of the world as will to power and try to analyze his perspectivism

²⁹⁷ Babich, *Nietzsche's Philosophy Science*, p. 39. Babich, in order to get rid of the relativist implications of the term 'perspectivism', uses 'perspectivalism' to refer to Nietzsche's perspectivist position.

through the concepts and definitions of another world construction, which is rejected by that very world construction of Nietzsche, then you could neither understand what perspectivism means nor how important and original it is.

For Nietzsche, there are no subjective states as Poellner assumes. Firstly, there are no subjects at all. Secondly, those supposed subjective inner states are also phenomenal as the outer states are, and the nature of the inner states and the inner world are not different from the nature of the external world. “I maintain the phenomenality of the inner world, too” says Nietzsche, and adds that “[t]he ‘apparent *inner* world’ is governed by just the same forms and procedures as the ‘outer’ world.”²⁹⁸ For Nietzsche, there is nothing special about the inner world and inner states; they are phenomenal and they are subjected to the same procedures as the outer world. Thus, there are no two distinct realms of existence, whose conditions are different, and, hence, in which perspectivism may mean two different things. Moreover, the natural condition of all entities is the struggle for power; everything, including what we may mean by the term subject, is will to power and in a constant struggle with others for increasing its power. There is no entity that is not involved in power struggle, and it is impossible speak of the existence of an entity that is motionless. As Nietzsche says “[l]ife is will to power”²⁹⁹ and “[h]ow can anything dead ‘be’?”³⁰⁰ Every entity, in the power struggle, determines both itself and the other party or parties involved in that struggle. Hence, every entity knows each other through the power struggle; that is “[t]he feeling of strength, of struggle, of resistance convinces us that there is something that is here being resisted.”³⁰¹ This process does not include any mental, subjective, or perspectival state of the opponent power center. Thus, Poellner’s claim about perspective knowing of those subjective states is not included in Nietzsche’s perspectivism as Poellner interprets it. That is, subjective states of a subject do not depend on the

²⁹⁸ WP, §477, p. 264.

²⁹⁹ WP, §254, p. 148.

³⁰⁰ WP, §582, p. 312.

³⁰¹ WP, §533, p. 290.

perspective of an external interpreter. What we perceive and interpret from our perspective is not the subject's inner states, but the movements of that subject, i.e., his or her resistance to us. However, it is our habit, or belief in causality, to infer from a movement of a subject that there occurs some kind of internal activity as the cause of that movement. "[w]herever we see or divine movement in a body," says Nietzsche, "we learn to conclude that there is a subjective, invisible life appertaining to it. Movement is symbolism for the eye; it indicates that something has been felt, willed, thought."³⁰² Thus, there is no point in attributing a perspective understanding of the inner states of the subject to Nietzsche's perspectivism: there exist neither subject nor subjective inner states. These points will become clear when we examine Nietzsche's rejection of the subject-object distinction in the following parts of this chapter. To conclude our discussion of Poellner's claim of relativity of Nietzsche's perspectivism, especially concerning inner states of the other human subjects, we can say that his argument cannot doom Nietzsche to relativism.

As we have seen, Nietzsche's perspectivism is not a version of relativism. This opens the way for Nietzsche to accuse the epistemological roots of the Western metaphysics as being perspectival falsifications. That is, if perspectivism is a version of relativism then the claims of perspectivism, relativism, and Western metaphysics becomes equally true, in which case there remains no way to refute neither of them; yet, as it is not a kind of relativism, it has the power of distinguishing a bad perspectival interpretation from the good one. Let us now turn to Nietzsche's attacks on those perspectival falsifications—i.e., logic, causality, subject-object and apparent-real world distinctions—of Western metaphysics.

3.5 Logic

Logic is one of the most important perspectival interpretations, or falsifications, of the world, which, because of its utility, has become the judge, who evaluates and determines truth and value of our beliefs and knowledge. Any thought,

³⁰² WP, §492, p. 271.

belief, idea or statement that cannot pass the test of the logic is not allowed to enter into the domain of glorious human knowledge. That is, any idea, not certified by logic and its rules is dismissed as not being coherent with the already acquired and proved to be beneficial for the preservation and the enhancement of mankind. For Nietzsche, our ideas are only interpretations of the world made by us from the perspective of our preservation and enhancement. Every one of us, as a highly complex power center, interprets the world and has ideas about the world according to his or her perspectives. Logic, then, appears as the tool for creating a stable world order from this chaos of ideas by eliminating our incoherent ideas about the world and reality. As Nietzsche puts it, there was “[o]riginally a chaos of ideas. The ideas that were consistent with one another remained, the greater number perished—and are perishing.”³⁰³

Logic and its rules are the mechanism, or the process, through which the consistency of our ideas are judged. We use the fundamental rules or principles of logic, e.g., principles of identity and non-contradiction, in creating the stable and consistent life-world for us. Nietzsche regards these principles as the “regulative articles of faith.”³⁰⁴ These regulative principles and laws do not come from experience; they are independent of experience, and thus, they are “forms of pure knowledge” or *a priori* truths. “The basic laws of logic, the law of identity and the law of contradiction, are forms of pure knowledge, because they precede all experience.”³⁰⁵ These *a priori* truths, or the basic laws of logic, as they are free from the influences of the changing world, are purely formal and general; therefore, they are regarded as universally valid. This means that these *a priori* universal laws are applied to all cases in judging our experiences. Yet, this universal applicability of the laws of logic assumes a world of being, in which there are identical cases. That is, as Grimm says, in order for rules of logic to work “there must exist identical objects, identical cases and events to which the

³⁰³ WP §508, p. 276.

³⁰⁴ WP §530, p. 288.

³⁰⁵ WP §530, pp. 287-88.

procedures of logic can apply.”³⁰⁶ For Nietzsche, however, there are neither identical objects, nor cases, nor events. As we know, for him, the world is in a constant flux, which excludes identity of things in time. Thus, logic depends on a false assumption that the world is a stable unity in which there are identical entities and events. According to Nietzsche, this assumption is the condition of logic and logical thought.

Logic is bound to the condition: assume there are identical cases. In fact, to make possible logical thinking and inferences, this condition must first be treated fictitiously as fulfilled. That is: the will to logical truth can be carried through only after a fundamental *falsification* of all events is assumed. From which it follows that a drive rules here that is capable of employing both means, firstly falsification, then the implementation of its own point of view: logic does *not* spring from will to truth.³⁰⁷

Nietzsche argues that we falsify the world through falsifying its chaotic and changing character, and then we impose a stable and well-ordered character to the world in accordance with our own perspective of preserving our existence. In other words, logic does not stem from our desire to gain the knowledge of the world, but from our desire to preserve ourselves. Hence, at the origin of logic and the logical thinking, there lies the interest of self-preservation. As Nietzsche says, what we aim by using logic is “[n]ot ‘to know’ but to schematize—to impose upon chaos as much regularity and form as our practical needs require.”³⁰⁸ Therefore, logic and the logical thought are the processes, or tools, for creating a simplified and predictable world in order to facilitate human existence in the chaotic world. Yet, this simple, predictable and calculable world is achieved at the expense of the falsification, or the denial, of the world in which we live; that is, we deny the world of becoming, in which predictions and calculations do not work, and create an illusory world, which is the most suitable for our needs in maintaining our existence.

³⁰⁶ Grimm, p. 78.

³⁰⁷ WP, §512, p. 277.

³⁰⁸ WP, §515, p. 278.

Prediction and calculability, for Nietzsche, require equal and similar cases, events and objects. As these similarities and equalities do not exist in the world, they are artificially created by us. We create categories and try to fit every object, event or case into these categories ignoring, or overlooking, their changing characters. Actually, as Nietzsche points out, this equalization and categorization process is necessary in the process of the development of logic and rational thinking.

In the formation of reason, logic, the categories, it was *need* that was authoritative: the need, not to “know,” but subsume, to schematize, for the purpose of intelligibility and calculation—(The development of reason is adjustment, invention, with the aim of making similar, equal—the same process that every sense impression goes through!) No pre-existing “idea” was here at work, but the utilitarian fact that only when we see things coarsely and made equal do they become calculable and usable to us.³⁰⁹

Thus, at the origin of logic and logical thought, there lies our practical needs, which require that the world be calculable and predictable, and logic and the logical thought help us to construct a stable world order, by providing us with principles and categories that organize the objects and events in the world into a coherent and harmonious unity. However, logic could not create that well-ordered world only through its rules and principles, our sense organs also contribute to the creation of this world by coarsely treating the world. In other words, we sense the world very cursorily and ignore its dynamic and changing character to create that stable world order. This cursory view of the world enables us to put different objects and events under the same category. Moreover, this coarse comprehension of the world as an ordered unity, logic and the categories of reason contribute to our survival by availing for us a quick understanding of the world. According to Nietzsche, “[t]he inventive force that invented categories labored in the service of our needs, namely of our need for

³⁰⁹ WP, §515, p. 278.

security, for quick understanding on the basis of signs and sounds, for means of abbreviation.”³¹⁰

Through logic and logical thinking, we impose sameness and regularity to the world, which enables us to take the control of it; this enables us to dominate and exploit the world in accordance with our practical needs. However, there is no sameness or regularity in the world, what we have is a chaotic and ever-changing world of dynamic power quanta. In spite of this fact, our need to preserve ourselves compels us to create a calculable and predictable world, because we could not survive in a world which is not stable and predictable. As Nietzsche puts it, this imposition of regularity and sameness, the creation of a stable world order, is necessary for life: “Life is founded upon the premise of a belief in enduring and regularly occurring things; the more powerful life is, the wider must be the knowable world to which we, as it were, attribute being. Logicizing, systematizing as expedients of life.”³¹¹

The creation of the calculable and predictable world order through logic and logical thinking is a falsification and simplification of the world. That is, we make the world regular and predictable one through simplifying it by eliminating and overlooking its aspects, which do not fit into our logical categories, and through this simplification of the reality we falsify that reality and create an illusion. This illusory worldview facilitates our survival and preservation, we regard this illusory world order as the ultimate and the correct way of viewing the world. We justify this illusory order by its utility, and if it is proven that this world view is beneficial in preserving our existence, then this illusion becomes a truth for us. However, this is not the case for Nietzsche; that is, the utility of this illusion cannot be the proof of its truth. According to him, as a morality tested and developed through time becomes a law after it is proved to be useful by long experience, and its values are regarded as venerable and unassailable, without questioning its origin and development; in the same way, logic and the categories

³¹⁰ WP, §513, p. 277.

³¹¹ WP, §552, pp. 298-99.

of reason, because of their utility in the preservation of man, become ultimate truths.

Exactly the same thing could have happened with the categories of reason: they could have prevailed, after much groping and fumbling, through their relative utility—There came a point when one collected them together, raised them to consciousness as a whole—and when one commanded them, i.e., when they had the effect of a command—From then on, they counted as *a priori*, as beyond experience, as irrefutable. And yet perhaps they represent nothing more than the expediency of a certain race and species—their utility alone is their “truth.”³¹²

The forgetting of the origin and the development of the stable and well-ordered world view prevents us to see its relation with our experience and the experiential world, and it becomes *a priori* truth. We forget that we have imposed sameness and regularity on the world, and behave as if there is really a regular world and we have discovered the regularities in that world. What we have done through logic is to show that there is a regularity in the world independent of us and our practical needs by proving that there is a correspondence between the principles of logic and the objects and the events in the world; hence, the world is a logical unity. However, for Nietzsche, it was we who made the world logical. That is, before applying logic to world and our judgments about it, we impose the postulates of logic to world, and find out that the world is consistent with postulates of the logic. Hence, the world as the regular and stable unity is only a perspectival interpretation, or falsification, made by us to secure our existence in the chaotic world.

Our subjective compulsion to believe in logic only reveals that, long before logic itself entered our consciousness, we did nothing but introduce its postulates into events: now we discover them in events—we can no longer do otherwise—and imagine that this compulsion guarantees something connected with “truth.” It is we who created the “thing,” the “identical thing,” subject, attribute, activity, object, substance, form, after we had long pursued the process of making identical, coarse

³¹² WP, §514, p. 278.

and simple. The world seems logical to us because we have made it logical.³¹³

Let us now examine Nietzsche's attack on the principle of contradiction, which, for Aristotle, is the certain of all principles on which the all other principles rests,³¹⁴ to show that logic and principles of it are only our products; i.e., our interpretations. Nietzsche begins to analyze the principle to find out what presuppositions lie at the bottom of it. According to him, this principle could be based on two different presuppositions. The first one is that the principle implies that there is an objective reality, such that we know that attributing it opposite qualities causes a contradiction. This means that we already know something about the reality, or being. That is, we know that an object could not carry contrary attributes before postulating the principle of contradiction. This implies that the principle on which all other principles depend, which is the most secure of all principles, is not true *a priori*, it comes from our previous knowledge concerning being; hence could not be the most certain of all principles. In Nietzsche's words, this principle seems to be asserting "something about actuality, about being, as if one already knew this from another source; that is, opposite attributes *could* not be ascribed to it."³¹⁵ The second possible implication of this principle is that it only gives us the advice that we should not ascribe opposite attributes to being. This means that we have created the world in which we live from our perspective and logic and its rules are designated to ensure this predictable and secure world. In Nietzsche's words, "[i]n that case, logic would be an imperative, not to know the true, but to posit and arrange a world that shall be called true by us."³¹⁶ From this argumentation Nietzsche concludes that the principle of contradiction could not

³¹³ WP, §521, pp. 282-83.

³¹⁴ In *Metaphysics*, Aristotle introduced the principle of contradiction as the most certain and the most basic of all principles as follows: "the same attribute cannot at the same time belong and not belong to the same subject and in the same respect . . . for if a man were mistaken on this point he would have contrary opinions at the same time." Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, trans. by W. D. Ross, (Book IV, Chapter 3), p. 100, in *World's Greatest Classic Books*, CDROM, Version 1.00.021, Corel Corporation, 1995.

³¹⁵ WP, §516, p. 279.

³¹⁶ WP, §516, p. 279.

be the criterion of truth, at most it would be “an *imperative* that which should count as true.”³¹⁷

Moreover, in the same passage, Nietzsche examines the principle of self-identity to show again that logic could not be the criterion of truth. According to Nietzsche, the principle of self-identity presupposes that there are unchanging beings in the world. In other words, this principle, and of course logic, depends on the belief that there are things-in-themselves. Because it is impossible to maintain self-identity of a thing in spite of the evidences that experiences gives us. That is, we experience that things change through time, yet this fact does not prevent us from claiming that things preserve their self identity through time. What enables us to make this claim is our belief in thing-in-itself. However, as we know that Nietzsche is opposed to the views of the world, which contemplate an unchanging world. We further know that, for him, there is no such thing as the thing-in-itself. Believing such a concept presupposes that there is an unchanging world, which is beyond the experience; that is, such a concept of being means that there is a metaphysical, i.e., real world, behind the experiential world. Nietzsche, proceeding on his denials of the thing-in-itself, and of the metaphysical world, makes a thought experiment concerning the validity and meaning of the principle of self-identity. He claims that if there is no being as in-itself and there is no metaphysical world, then there could not be a self-identical thing as “A.” As Nietzsche puts it,

[s]upposing there were no self-identical “A”, such as is presupposed by every proposition of logic (and of mathematics), and the “A” were already mere appearance, then logic would have a merely apparent world as its condition . . . The “thing”—that is the real substratum of “A”; our belief in things is the precondition of our belief in logic. The “A” of logic is, like the atom, a reconstruction of the thing.³¹⁸

However, the “A,” as self-identical, is our construction and there is nothing behind it as substratum, which secures its self-identity through time.

³¹⁷ WP, §516, p. 279.

³¹⁸ WP, §516, p. 279.

Therefore, the principle of self-identity, and of course that of contradiction, are based on a metaphysical world, which is merely our interpretation of the apparent world from the perspective of our preservation. As Nietzsche notes, if we ignore this fact and make logic our criterion of truth, then we accept those constructions as absolute truths. That is, we ignore, or forget, that logic and the logical world are our constructions, and this ignorance leads us to regard these constructions as truths. As Nietzsche says, “[i]f we do not grasp this, but make of logic a criterion of true being, we are on the way to positing as realities all those hypostases: substance, attribute, object, action, etc.; that is, to conceiving a metaphysical world, that is, a “real world” (*—this, however, is the apparent world once more.*)”³¹⁹ Hence, logic and its principles are nothing but keys for entering into the stable world constructed by human species to preserve itself. If you refuse, or are unable, to use these keys, you will not be able to enter that safe world.

According to Nietzsche, what lies behind logic and logical thought is the belief that we can attain knowledge and that our judgments directed by logic could grasp truths. We do not doubt the ability of logic to grasp the being-in-itself and assert something about it; i.e., it cannot have contradictory attributes at the same time. However, for Nietzsche, this is the result of our prejudice that sensations give us truths about things. For example, I cannot say that one and the same thing is hot and cold at the same time. We judge this statement by appealing to the instinctual proof that “I cannot have two opposite sensations at the same time.”³²⁰ However, this kind of proof, for Nietzsche, is very coarse and false. Our sensations, as well as our apparatus of knowledge, are developed in accordance with the requirements of our preservation: “All our organs of knowledge and our senses are developed only with regard to conditions of preservation and growth.”³²¹ Hence, our sensations are limited by conditions of our preservation, and do not go beyond this limit. When we place this coarse

³¹⁹ WP, §516, p. 279.

³²⁰ WP, §516, p. 280.

³²¹ WP, §507, pp. 275-76.

sensualistic mechanism at the basis of the main principle of logic, namely, principle of contradiction, we undermine that principle. Because, there may be other properties of an entity that our sense organs could not sense, and those properties might be the opposite of those that we could sense. Or, there might, even be some qualities that transcend our sense organs' capabilities, among which there might be directly opposite ones. Nietzsche says that "we have senses for only a selection of perceptions—those with which we have to concern ourselves in order to preserve ourselves."³²²

The principle of contradiction, for Nietzsche, stems from our confident belief that we form concepts that are capable of comprehending beings in their essence. However, the process of the formation of the concepts is not so firm. Let us look at Nietzsche's explanation of this process in his "Truth and Lies." There, at the outset, he mentions the formation of language. Simply put, firstly, a sensation, or "a nerve stimulus" as Nietzsche calls it, "transferred in to an image: first metaphor," afterwards, this image "is imitated in a sound: second metaphor."³²³ Hence, what we get through language is only metaphors, not the nature or the essence of things. However, Nietzsche says that "we believe that we know something about the things themselves when we speak of trees, colors, snow, and flowers; and yet we possess nothing but metaphors for things—metaphors which correspond in no way to the original entities."³²⁴ This origin of language and words is ignored, and used by us as if they correspond to things or events in the world. When the words are used for referring not to a single object or an event, they become concepts. In other words, "a word becomes a concept insofar as it simultaneously has to fit countless more or less similar cases."³²⁵ However, this means, for Nietzsche, that concepts do fit similar cases, but these cases are never equal; i.e., we refer by the concept "leaf" to all leaves, ignoring the

³²² WP, §505, p. 275. A similar view is expressed in the following fragment: "It is improbable that our 'knowledge' should extend further than is strictly necessary for the preservation of life. Morphology shows us how the senses and the nerves, as well as the brain, develop in proportion to the difficulty of finding nourishment." (WP, §494, p. 272.)

³²³ TL, p. 82.

³²⁴ TL, pp. 82-83.

³²⁵ TL, p. 83.

fact that there is no identical with any other leaf. Hence, Nietzsche concludes that “[e]very concept arises from the equation of unequal things.”³²⁶ The idea of concept as designating and comprehending the essence of a thing is only a fiction. Our concepts are nothing but metaphorical fictions created through a process in which the starting point is our sensual mechanisms, which are developed according to the requirements of our survival. This means that the world, with which logic is engaged, is created by us out of the chaotic world to make that chaotic world a predictable and calculable unity: “In fact, logic (like geometry and arithmetic) applies only to fictitious entities that we have created. Logic is the attempt to comprehend the actual world by means of a scheme of being posited by ourselves; more correctly, to make it formulatable and calculable for us.”³²⁷

Therefore, our belief in logic as the discipline or the way, which leads us to correct thinking, is only an illusion based on our world view, in which there are similar objects and events that make the world a regular unity. As far as this falsification of the world increases our power, Nietzsche will not be against it. Yet, as Nietzsche observes, this understanding of the world prevents us from engaging or pursuing other ways of comprehending the world. There may be other ways of constructing the world that would allow us to increase our power more than this understanding of the world allows. In other words, regarding logic and logical thinking as the only way of thinking, or regarding them as absolute truths, prevents us from reaching a higher level of development and power. Moreover, what we have for ensuring that logic and its principles are unchanging and absolute truths is only their utility. As we have seen earlier, the correspondence between the logical principles and the world is nothing but a result of our positing of postulates of the logic on the world before applying logic to it; that is, what we see as correspondence is a fiction created by us. The only judge that could justify and validate our belief in logic is its utility in our preservation. However, as Grimm rightly observes, the fact that logic is useful in

³²⁶ TL, p. 83.

³²⁷ WP, §516, p. 280.

our preservation does not guarantee that it is “unchangeably and absolutely true” and that it “will continue to be of utility.”³²⁸

When we regard our useful fictions, which are the results of our perspectival interpretations of the world, as ultimate truths, as corresponding to the world in which we try to preserve our existence, they would become constraints for us to reach a more richer and fuller life. To stick to absolute truths is nothing but a symbol of cowardice and weakness, and it belongs to the mediocre type of man. Preservation and happiness are the motivating factors behind mediocre types’ sticking themselves to absolute truths. They prefer to live in a stable and predictable, yet limited and poorer world; they have no courage to venture this life to get a more richer and fuller life. They stick strictly to logic and logical thought to preserve this happy and poor life. Nietzsche names this tendency as “decadence,” and says that

[d]ecadence betrays itself in this preoccupation with “happiness” (i.e., with ‘salvation of the soul,’ i.e., to fell one’s condition as danger). The fanaticism of its interest in “happiness” indicates the pathological nature of the hidden cause: it was a life-or-death interest. To be reasonable or perish was the alternative before which they all stood.³²⁹

Hence, to stick to rational or logical thought is a type of decadence and inimical to life. It is inimical, because it impoverishes life; it prevents life from reaching higher levels. By accepting our perspectival interpretations as absolute truths, we limit our life and world. However, these absolute truths have nothing to do with the world; they are only fictions that we impose over it. We should be aware of this fact and search for the other ways, or fictions, to enhance our powers and lives. In other words, as Nietzsche points out, we should be aware of the fact that “[r]ational thought is interpretation according to a scheme that we cannot throw off,”³³⁰ and venture it to find out other ways of structuring the world by employing our creative energies.

³²⁸ Grimm, p. 80.

³²⁹ WP, §433, pp. 237-38.

³³⁰ WP, §522, p. 283.

3.6 Subject-Object Distinction

One of the main presuppositions of our cognitive paradigm is the distinction between subject and object. However, like other presuppositions of our cognitive paradigm, Nietzsche sees it as another perspectival falsification of the world. According to him, at the basis of the distinction, there lies the separation of the doer from the deed, of the actor from the act. As we saw earlier, for Nietzsche, a thing cannot be separable from its activities; if we remove all the activities of a thing, it ceases to exist. An entity or a thing, for him, is nothing but the totality of its activities, and there is nothing purely passive or motionless.

A quantum of force is equivalent to a quantum of drive, will, effect—more, it is nothing other than precisely this very driving, willing, effecting, and only owing to the seduction of language (and of the fundamental errors of reason that are petrified in it) which conceives and misconceives all effects as conditioned by something that causes effects, by a “subject,” can it appear otherwise.³³¹

This separation is so strongly rooted in our language that we could not comprehend any event without it. To those events, in which we could not see any apparent subject, we immediately add a fictitious one to meet that grammatical requirement. For example, we say “lightning flashes,” “thunder crushes,” “fire burns,” etc. In these statements, the same event stated twice; first as a subject, and second as an object; or first as a cause, and second as its effect. Nietzsche says that “[t]he popular mind in fact doubles the deed; when it sees the lightning flash, it is the deed of a deed: it posits the same event as first as cause and then second time as its effect.”³³²

As Grimm notes, such a separation implies that “an agent or subject might be capable of *not* acting,”³³³ and this is not acceptable for Nietzsche.

³³¹ BGE, I, §13, p. 45.

³³² BGE, I, §13, p. 45. Nietzsche applies the same line of reasoning when he criticizes Descartes’ *cogito*, see pp. 131-133. Moreover, the same argumentation is present in Lichtenberg’s criticism of Cartesian *cogito*. Lichtenberg says “[w]e would say *it thinks*, just as we say *it lightens*. To say *cogito* is already to say too much as soon as we translate it *I think*. To assume, to postulate the *I* is a practical requirement.” (George Christoph Lichtenberg, *The Waste Books*, trans. R. J. Hollingdale, New York: New York Review Books, 2000, Notebook K (1793-1796), §18, p. 190.)

³³³ Grimm, p. 82.

Because this implies that there is a neutral substratum that is free of all desires and wills behind the actor. Such a conception of subject, as the doctrine of the will to power suggests, is nonsense; because it places a metaphysical subject or substratum behind every deed, whose existence is not possible in that world implied by the doctrine of the will to power. That is, the doctrine makes it impossible for some entity, which does not act, move, or change at all, to exist; whatever has existence is only an active and dynamic power quantum. Hence, subject is a fiction added by us according to the requirements of the grammar of our language, in which our metaphysical world conception is strongly rooted. Tracy B. Strong emphasizes the similarity between the separation of the subject from his acts and the distinction between real and apparent worlds; “separation of a person from his acts” is “analogous to the distinction of the ‘real’ and ‘apparent’ worlds. The actor, if considerable apart from his action, assumes the role of the ‘real’ world. The action in question is held to be a conditioned part of the actor; the actor acquires permanence which is not allowed to the action.”³³⁴

This separation has also moral connotations. To separate a person from his or her actions means that the person in question could be judged independent of his actions. That is, as this separation constructs the subject as a neutral entity by removing his or her link with that action, that subject also gains a moral independence. Strong says that “[t]he actor is thus reified into an entity which has conceptual and potentially moral independence of his acts.”³³⁵ Hence, the subject is separated from the actual world and placed into a metaphysical one. This enables us to judge the subject according to the metaphysical categories that are built into our language. This judgment shows us that the subject might have acted or behaved differently. That is, separation of action from the subject gives way to judge the subject in terms of his or her acts, yet such a judgment implies that there is a subject that could have done otherwise. A fiction becomes the subject of moral judgment. According to Nietzsche, as in the case of lightning

³³⁴ Tracy B. Strong, “Language and Nihilism: Nietzsche’s Critique of Epistemology,” *Theory and Society*, 3 (1976), p. 250.

³³⁵ Strong, “Language and Nihilism: Nietzsche’s Critique of Epistemology,” p. 250.

and flash, our morality also separates the actor from his action; “popular morality also separates strength from expression of strength, as if there were a neutral substratum behind a strong man, which was *free* to express strength or not to do so.”³³⁶ This morality takes the subject as responsible for his or her actions, yet there is no such entity as the subject; it is only a fiction; “there is no such substratum; there is no ‘being’ behind doing, effecting, becoming; ‘the doer’ is merely a fiction added to the deed—the deed is everything.”³³⁷ Hence, Nietzsche rejects this artificial separation of act from the actor.

However, as Grimm indicates, this rejection could only eliminate the “subject” part of the fundamental distinction between subject and object. That is, “if we accept Nietzsche’s assertion that action and actor (i.e., subject) are identical, there still remains the objective half of the distinction which remains, apparently, unaffected.”³³⁸ In my opinion, this objection is already answered in our discussion of Nietzsche’s rejection of the act-actor distinction. As we have just seen, there is nothing stable and changeless in the world; every entity exists only through its activities. Hence, the notion of an object, which is stable and unchanging, i.e., as thing-in-itself, is nonsense. What we call as object is only a power quantum or quanta in search of more power. That is, there is no difference between subject and object in that they both are power centers, and they both interpret and shape each other and their environment in accordance with requirements of their needs. Therefore, as Nietzsche indicates, to speak of object or objectivity outside this interpretation process, as if there is an entity transcending interpretation, is wrong. “That things possess a constitution in themselves quite apart from interpretation and subjectivity, is a quite idle hypothesis: it presupposes that interpretation and subjectivity are not essential, that a thing freed from all relationships would still be a thing.”³³⁹ In other words, as Nietzsche’s perspectivism claims, the world is nothing but our interpretations

³³⁶ GM, I, §13, p. 45.

³³⁷ GM, I, §13, p. 45.

³³⁸ Grimm, p. 83.

³³⁹ WP, §560, pp. 302-3.

made from the perspective of preserving and enhancing our power. The notions of subject and object, as we ordinarily understand, are nothing but our interpretations; hence, it is impossible to attribute them any property, and even to construct them outside our perspectival interpretations. Therefore, as Nietzsche maintains, objectivity could be merely our interpretation of other power centers, whose activities could not be perceived by us; that is, we interpret an entity as object because of our deficient sensual abilities and, naturally, of our needs. This is what Nietzsche means when he claims that objectivity is a degree, or, as Grimm says, a subspecies,³⁴⁰ of subjectivity. “[T]he apparent *objective* character of things,” says Nietzsche, “could it not be merely a difference of degree within the subjective?—that perhaps that which changes slowly presents itself to us as ‘objectively’ enduring, being, ‘in-itself’—that the objective is only a false conception of a genus and an antithesis *within* the subjective?”³⁴¹

Hence, objectivity is only an interpretation; it has nothing to do with the nature of the entities in the world. It is we who create the concepts of subject and object; in reality, there are neither subjects nor objects, but only dynamic quanta or quantum of power. These two concepts are the results of our desire to create a stable and predictable world out of the chaotic world of power quanta.

The distinction between subject and object is one of the important distinctions in constructing and securing that stable and predictable world. Descartes’ *cogito* is the case, in which we can see the importance of this separation in work. This is why Descartes is one of the philosophers harshly criticized by Nietzsche. Because Descartes in his arguments concerning the *cogito* commits both the separation of the act from the actor and the distinction between subject and object. As we know, Descartes searches for a secure foundation to build the edifice of knowledge, and he reaches the conclusion that the only piece of knowledge that he could not suspect is the fact that he is thinking. From this, he concludes his existence, and declares that famous Cartesian argument: “I think, therefore I am.” Through this motto, Descartes

³⁴⁰ Grimm, pp. 83-84. “. . . objectivity is but a subspecies of the concept ‘subjectivity.’”

³⁴¹ WP, §560, p. 303.

separates thinking from the thinker; he, from the existence of thought, concludes that there must be an entity, whose essential activity is thinking. This means that without an agent, or a subject, there could not be any activity of thinking. For Nietzsche, this is nothing but, as we see from the discussions above, the seduction of our language, which adds a doer to every deed. Hence, for Nietzsche, Descartes' *cogito* does not express an indubitable truth, but a "strong belief."

"There is thinking: therefore there is something that thinks": this is the upshot of all Descartes' argumentation. But that means positing as "true *a priori*" our belief in the concept of substance—that when there is thought there has to be something "that thinks" is simply a formulation of our grammatical custom that adds a doer to every deed. In short, this is not merely the substantiation of a fact but a logical-metaphysical postulate—Along the lines followed by Descartes one does not come upon something absolutely certain but only upon the fact of a very strong belief.³⁴²

Moreover, Descartes' *cogito*, for Nietzsche, expresses a tautology. That is, when I say that "I think, therefore I am," what I say is that I have a thought, which means that I am thinking, and as a non-existing being I could not think, therefore I must exist. In other words, there are thoughts, and this implies the occurrence of the activity of thinking, and without an agent that activity could not occur, therefore there must be an agent that thinks. As these reconstructions of the *cogito* suggests, we can take it as simply saying that "there is thinking, therefore there are thoughts," which is an obvious tautology. "If one reduces the proposition to 'There is thinking therefore there are thoughts,'" says Nietzsche, "one has produced a mere tautology."³⁴³ Since, according to our conceptual scheme, there would be no thought without the activity of thinking, and the activity of thinking results in thoughts. Hence, *cogito* is a tautological statement, and does not give us, or Descartes, any secure or certain knowledge. According to Nietzsche, in the *cogito*, the question of the reality of thought is not answered;

³⁴² WP, §484, p. 268.

³⁴³ WP, §484, p. 268.

it is taken as real. Hence, in the *cogito*, the reality of thought is assumed, yet this reality, for Nietzsche, is only an apparent, or perspectival reality. However, “what Descartes desired was that thought should have, not an *apparent* reality, but a reality *in itself*.”³⁴⁴

The reality of thought is not the only assertion made in Descartes’ *cogito*. There are also other assertions accepted as true without questioning. To illustrate, I am the one who thinks, there must be something that thinks, there is a causal connection between thought and thinker, there is a conscious ego, and “what thinking is” is known by me. These assertions are accepted as true, yet, for Nietzsche, it is impossible to prove that they are true. He says the following: “When I analyze the process that is expressed in the sentence ‘I think,’ I find a whole series of daring assertions that would be difficult, perhaps impossible, to prove.”³⁴⁵ These assertions are the products of our grammar; i.e., for the thinking subject, or ego, Nietzsche says “[o]ne infers here according to the grammatical habit: ‘thinking is an activity; every activity requires an agent.’”³⁴⁶ Hence, Descartes could not reach the immediate certainty as the secure and indubitable ground of edifice of knowledge; since his *cogito* is full of unquestioned and unproven assertions resulting from our language and grammar. Nietzsche, referring to Descartes’ unquestioning of these assertions, ironically says that “the person who says ‘I think, and know that this, at least, is true, actual, and certain’—will encounter a smile and two question marks from a philosopher nowadays. ‘Sir,’ the philosopher will perhaps give him to understand, ‘it is improbable that you are not mistaken; but why insist on the truth?’”³⁴⁷

To sum up, the distinction between subject and object, and between act, actor, and acted upon, are perspectival fictions created by us. There are no such things as subject and object, or actor and acted upon, or a separate entity as action. All of these are imposed upon the world by us due to the requirements of

³⁴⁴ WP, §484, p. 268.

³⁴⁵ BGE, §16, p. 23.

³⁴⁶ BGE, §17, p. 24.

³⁴⁷ BGE, §16, p. 24.

our language and its grammar. We create these fictions to simplify and arrange the chaotic world of power quanta with the aim of creating a stable and predictable world order. Our cognitive apparatus and language are not capable of comprehending the world of becoming, but of being. Therefore, we create such fictions when we are faced with chaotic reality to make it comprehensible with our cognitive apparatus. However, these fictions have nothing to do with the reality and truth; they neither represent nor comprehend the reality as it *is*. As Nietzsche says, “[w]e setup a word at the point at which our ignorance begins, at which we can see no further, e.g., the word ‘I,’ the word ‘do,’ the word ‘suffer’—these are perhaps the horizon of our knowledge, but not ‘truths.’”³⁴⁸

3.7 Apparent-Real World Distinction

The distinction between the apparent and the real world is another perspectival falsification made by us to ensure our existence in the world of becoming. As we can easily guess, for Nietzsche, there is no such a distinction; since the only world that we have is the world in which we live. For him, at the root of this distinction, there lies the conditions of our survival; as our survival requires a stable and predictable world, we create it fictitiously. The world, in which we live, is in constant change; there is nothing stable in it. However, as our survival requires stability, disdaining this world as being apparent, we posit another “real” world, which is stable, controllable and predictable, over and beyond it.

“The *real* and the *apparent* world”—I have traced this antithesis back to *value* relations. We have projected the conditions of *our* preservation as predicated of being in general. Because we have to stable in our beliefs if we are to prosper, we have made the “real” world a world not of change and becoming, but one of being.³⁴⁹

The physical world as a world of becoming could not meet the requirements of our preservation, i.e., it could not gives us the required stability and predictability. If our knowledge of the world, or of anything, is to be useful

³⁴⁸ WP, §482, p. 267.

³⁴⁹ WP, §507, p. 276.

in our survival, it should be stable, reliable, and universal. That is, our preservation requires that we must have the knowledge of the world in which we live, yet this knowledge must be valid in everywhere and anytime. Otherwise, if our knowledge is provisional and temporary, it could not help us in our survival; since it could not be true in another place in another time. However, as our senses reveal to us that the physical world is in a constant change, this world must be false, or our senses deceive us about it.³⁵⁰ In any case, the physical world could not give us those eternal truths, which are essential for our survival. That is, the physical world is only for our senses, which deceive us. Therefore, the physical world could not be the source of eternal, unchanging, reliable, and universal knowledge and truth. It is evident that we have knowledge and truth, since we could manage to live. If the physical world is not the source of our knowledge, then there must be another source for this knowledge, which transcends our senses and the sensual physical world.

This source, for Plato, is the world of *Ideas*, which is a world for reason; that is, this world could not be achieved through our senses, but only through reason. Another example of such sources is the *otherworld* of the religions. These two worlds, world of ideas and the otherworld, are regarded as the “true” realms, and the physical world is degraded to the status of false and deceiving one. Plato’s world of Ideas and the otherworld of religions represent the true world, in which there is no temporality, no change, no death, no deceiving, etc.; that is, these worlds shape, secure, even guarantee, our understanding of the physical world. The idea of a real world behind the apparent one makes it possible for us to treat the changing reality as stable and unchanging, to conceive the world of becoming as the world of being. We ignore the changing character of the physical world, which is given to us through the sense, and base our life and all of our valuations on the unchanging real world, which is accessible only

³⁵⁰ Nietzsche, ironically, speaks of the philosophers’ blaming of the senses as the following: “they all believe, desperately even, in what has being. But since they never grasp it, they seek for reasons why it is kept from them. ‘There must be mere appearance, there must be some deception which prevents us from perceiving that which has being: where is the deceiver?’ . . . ‘We have found him,’ they cry ecstatically; ‘it is the senses! The senses, which are so immoral in other ways too, deceive us concerning the *true* world.’” TI, “‘Reason’ in Philosophy” §1, p. 480.

through reason. Hence, it is the idea of the “real world” that rescues us from the chaos and deceptions of the apparent world.

Nietzsche regards the real world as a fiction created out of fictitious entities. The real world is the world of being, yet, as we know, for Nietzsche, there is no such thing as being. However, in order to give an order to the chaotic world, we fictitiously create being. By using this fiction, we further create another fiction, that is, the real world, in which there is stable and unchanging order. However, for Nietzsche, the “real world” is also an apparent world, created through simplification, selection, and ordering. It is we who create this real world out of the apparent one. “The ‘real world,’” says Nietzsche, “however one has hitherto conceived it—it has always been the apparent world *once again*.”³⁵¹ We create the fictitious real world after the same model of the apparent world, which is another perspectival falsification of the world made by us; i.e., it is another fictitious world of the lower rank. That is, in order to live we create a relatively small, stable and calculable world out of the chaotic world of dynamic power quanta, and name it as the apparent world because there is change, death, and decay in it; yet, as we could manage to live in it, we apply the same concepts, categories, principles in constructing and conceiving the real world. However, as George J. Stack warns us, this statement should not be understood as saying that “we cannot ‘imagine’ a real world that does not turn out to be the (apparent) world we are familiar with in our experience.”³⁵² Because, then, there remains no need to postulate a real world, in which case the apparent and relative stability and calculability of the world could not be secured and guaranteed. In other words, our psychological needs compel us to guarantee the stability and predictability of the apparent, or physical, world by positing a real and true world beyond and behind that world. However, if the real world is designated as similar to the apparent world, then it could not be a reliable and respectable world. Hence, as Stack states, Nietzsche’s above claim should be

³⁵¹ WP, §566, p. 305. Elsewhere, again, Nietzsche speaks of the real world as being an apparent one; “a ‘real world’ (*—this, however, is the apparent world once more.*)” (WP, §516, p. 279)

³⁵² George J. Stack, *Lange and Nietzsche*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1983, p. 65.

understood as saying that “we cannot *conceive of* a transcendental ‘true world’ without doing so in terms of the concepts or categories that we apply to the ‘phenomenal world’ we experience.”³⁵³

As we saw earlier, for Nietzsche, it is our needs that interpret the world. In the same way, the distinction between the real and the apparent world is a perspectival interpretation, according to our psychological needs, i.e., security and preservation. In an important note, where he explores the psychological dimensions of nihilism, Nietzsche presents the postulation of the real world as a psychological need, and how its realization leads to the denial of the real world and nihilism. Yet, there, he also shows us that the denial of the real world is very difficult, even for the nihilists.

Given these two insights, that becoming has no goal and that underneath all becoming there is no grand unity in which the individual could immerse himself completely as in an element of supreme value, an escape remains: to pass sentence on this whole world of becoming as a deception and to invent a world beyond it, a *true* world. But as soon as man finds out how he has absolutely no right to it, the last form of nihilism comes into being: it includes disbelief in any metaphysical world and forbids itself any belief in a *true* world. Having reached this standpoint, one grants the reality of becoming as the *only* reality, forbids oneself every kind of clandestine access to afterworlds and false divinities—but *cannot endure this world though one does not want to deny it*.³⁵⁴

The real world, whether as philosopher’s metaphysical or religious afterworld, emerges from the psychological need for securing the consistency of our beliefs and perceptions. It is the only way escaping from the unbearable chaos resulting from the ever-changing character of the physical world. Hence, it seems implausible to interpret Nietzsche’s claim that real world is also an apparent one, as stating that we could not imagine a real world that becomes similar to the physical or phenomenal world, in which we live. Because, then we could not escape the chaos; we carry it into real world. However, as Stack rightly

³⁵³ George J. Stack, *Lange and Nietzsche*, p. 65.

³⁵⁴ WP, §12, p. 13.

notes, we use the same cognitive apparatus in understanding or comprehending both apparent and real worlds. Thus, what we do by postulating a real world is nothing but to create a stable and unchanging world of being and to transfer those values, laws, categories, truths, etc., which contribute our survival in the chaotic physical world, to the real world by trying to grasp it through them. Consequently, the apparent character of the real world does not come from our projecting it as such, but from our appealing the same rationality, which makes the physical world an apparent one.

On the other hand, the apparent world, as we perceive it, is as fictitious as the real world. That is, as Nietzsche puts it, “in a world where there is no being, a certain calculable world of identical cases must first be created through appearance: a tempo at which observation and comparison are possible, etc.”³⁵⁵ Apparent world is also a perspectival interpretation; we create it by arranging and simplifying it through our cognitive apparatus according to our needs. Hence, again, it is our needs that interpret the chaotic physical world as an ordered and stable unity. However, it should be remembered that this order and stability are not pure and firm as that is found in the real world; this is why, the real world is needed. Although the apparent world is a fiction, for Nietzsche, it belongs to the reality in two senses. First, it is a moment in the process of becoming; “[a]pppearance’ itself belongs to reality: it is a form of its being.”³⁵⁶ Second, a species of animal requires this fiction for its prosperity; “a particular species of animal that can prosper only through a certain relative rightness; above all, regularity of its perceptions.”³⁵⁷ However, in the latter case, this does not mean that the fiction constructed is a necessary and the only one; every power center, every species constructs its fiction according to its needs. As the physical world is in a constant flux, it continuously changes; hence, the needs and the interpretation of the according to these needs also changes. Therefore, to accept a fiction among the many actual and possible ones as the only true one is

³⁵⁵ WP, §568, p. 306.

³⁵⁶ WP, §568, p. 306.

³⁵⁷ WP, §480, p. 266.

nothing but to impoverish the world and life. In accordance with Nietzsche's perspectivism, the apparent world is merely an interpretation of the physical world; hence could not be accepted as the only way in which the world *is*; "[p]erspective . . . decides the character of 'appearance'!"³⁵⁸ There is nothing except from the fact that this fiction works and meets our needs to prove its truth. Yet, we accept this perspectival interpretation of the world as reflecting the actual state of the world; that is, we regard this fictitious world as an absolute truth.

However, the world to which we put the label of "the apparent world," is nothing but the totality of the actions and the reactions of power centers in their struggle for power. This struggle determines the character of the world. Hence, since the apparent world is a perspectival interpretation of the chaotic world of dynamic power centers, and since the process of interpretation is the process of simplifying and arranging the world according to our needs, the apparent world becomes a simplified and organized view of the chaotic world. That is, the apparent world is the totality of the actions of a power center on the others and the reactions or resistances it receives from them. Whatever we may sense, perceive, or name, as reality is only these actions and reactions of power centers. Hence, as Nietzsche claims "[n]o shadow of a right remains to speak here of *appearance*."³⁵⁹

Thus, Nietzsche's critique of the distinction between the real and the apparent world results in the conclusion that such a distinction is nonsense. For, there is neither the real world nor the apparent world. The real world is "invented by a lie,"³⁶⁰ and the apparent world is an interpretation of the world made from the perspective of a species of animal to preserve its existence among the dangers of the world of becoming. Neither the real world nor the world of being, exists; and the apparent world, although it is simplified and arranged, is the physical world, in which we live. The only real, or true, world is this physical

³⁵⁸ WP, §567, p. 305.

³⁵⁹ WP, §567, p. 305.

³⁶⁰ WP, §461, p. 254.

world, and as Nietzsche claims, the reasons for denying it as apparent one prove its reality; “[t]he reasons for which ‘this’ world has been characterized as ‘apparent’ are the very reasons which indicate its reality; any other kind of reality is absolutely indemonstrable”³⁶¹; hence, “[t]he antithesis of the apparent world and the true world is reduced to the antithesis ‘world’ and ‘nothing.’”³⁶² In other words, its being a changing and deceptive world are the reasons for claiming that the physical world is an apparent world, yet, for Nietzsche, since there is not a stable and unchanging world behind this world and we do not have any evidence for the existence of it. This means that we base our judgment concerning the apparent character of the physical world on our sense experience, but there is no such sense evidence for the existence of the real world that we place behind the apparent world. Thus, the changing and deceptive character of the world given to us through our sense organs becomes the proof of its reality. Furthermore, since there is no such evidence for the existence of the real world, the antithesis of true world and apparent world becomes the antithesis of “physical world” and “nothing.”

As we have seen from the above discussions of the distinction between the real and apparent world, for Nietzsche, this distinction is superficial and there are no two separate worlds, but only the one in which we live. According to Nietzsche, postulating such a distinction means denial of life. Because, through this distinction the life-world is devalued as apparent, and the real world honored as the world of absolute truths and values. As Nietzsche points out, the term “real world” already implies that “this world is untruthful, deceptive, dishonest, inauthentic, inessential—and consequently also not a world adapted to our needs (—inadvisable to adapt oneself to it; better to resist it).”³⁶³ As the apparent world is “untruthful,” “deceptive,” “dishonest,” “inauthentic,” it can be neither the cause nor the home of the absolute truths and the highest values. Plato’s placing of Good as the highest value and the highest object of knowledge is an example

³⁶¹ TI, “‘Reason’ in Philosophy” §6, p. 484.

³⁶² WP, §567, p. 306.

³⁶³ WP, §586, p. 320.

of the transference of the values and truths to the real world; “the good is the highest form of knowledge and . . . everything else is just or useful only in relation to it . . . without it no other knowledge and no other possession will be worth anything.”³⁶⁴ However, for Nietzsche, all judgments are value judgments; i.e., judgment is interpretation in terms of the preservation and enhancement of the judging individual. Hence, all judgments, all interpretations, as values, are actually vital values. To place vital values beyond this world, to put them into the world of dead entities and concepts, i.e., into the world of being, means denying and diminishing life. As such, the vital values are regarded as coming from the world of being, where there is no living entity; hence, the relation between the life and the vital values are corrupted. Instead of creating new values according to changing structure of the dynamic and chaotic world, we live with absolute values that are already defined. According to Nietzsche, the history of philosophy is the place where we can see this hostility to life. “The history of philosophy is a secret raging against the preconditions of life, against the value feelings of life, against partisanship in favor of life. Philosophers never hesitated to affirm a world provided it contradicted this world and furnished them with a pretext for speaking ill of this world.”³⁶⁵

According to Nietzsche, what leads philosophers to condemn this world as unreal and postulate another true world is morality as the supreme value. They believe that truth must also be moral; i.e., it should not be deceptive, inauthentic, etc.; “the true world must also be a truthful world, one that does not deceive us, does not make fools of us: to believe in it is virtually to be compelled to believe in it.”³⁶⁶ Hence, a strict relation between truth and morality is drawn: if something should be accepted as true it must also be truthful, and *vice versa*.

³⁶⁴ Plato, *Plato's Republic*, trans. Benjamin Jowett, ed. Albert A. Anderson, Massachusetts: Agora Publications Inc., 2001, (Book VI, 505a), p. 246.

³⁶⁵ WP, §461, p. 253. Elsewhere, Nietzsche puts the relation between positing a real world and hating life as follows: “To invent fables about a world ‘other’ than this one has no meaning at all, unless an instinct of slander, detraction, and suspicion against life has gained the upper hand in us: in that case, we avenge ourselves against life with a phantasmagoria of ‘another,’ a ‘better’ life.” TI, “‘Reason’ in Philosophy” §6, p. 484.

³⁶⁶ WP, §586, p. 320.

This further implies that values must be eternal and unchanging; since change and becoming contradict truth, then they also contradict value. In other words, this strict relation between truth and morality means that the moral values are transferred to the unchanging and eternal real world. As Grimm says, “[j]ust as truth must be unchanging if it is to be valid . . . so must value be unchanging if it is to be genuinely valuable.”³⁶⁷ Hence, the real world is regarded as valuable and the physical world denied as invaluable. That is, the physical world, as changing and unstable one, is deceptive; hence, it is neither true nor valuable. Thus, the distinction between the real and the apparent world is not only an ontological distinction, but also, maybe mainly, an axiological distinction. In a way, absolute values become a criterion of truth; or, a necessary quality that any truth, or any being, must have in order to be accepted as true. This is, for Nietzsche, one of the worst outcomes of the distinction between the real and apparent world. “The worst thing is that,” says Nietzsche, “with the old antithesis ‘apparent’ and ‘true’ the correlative value judgment ‘lacking in value’ and ‘absolutely valuable’ has developed. The apparent world is not counted as a ‘valuable’ world; appearance is supposed to constitute an objection to supreme value. Only a ‘true’ world can be valuable in itself.”³⁶⁸ Hence the world, in which we live, is doubly condemned; first, as being an unreal, or untrue, or apparent, and second, as being invaluable. In both evaluations, the criterion we apply is the real world of being and its truths and values. However, this world and all of its truths and values are dead, absolute, eternal ones, whereas we live in a world of constant change. Therefore, if we judge conditions of our lives with regard to this world and its truths and values, those conditions always seem to be false, apparent, and immoral. At every moment of our existence, we are faced with a different world; we and the rest of the world, as power centers struggling for more power, are continuously changing. Hence, to perceive and evaluate this world with the dead and stable concepts and values of the world of being amount to freeze this world and life.

³⁶⁷ Grimm, p. 35.

³⁶⁸ WP, §583, p. 313.

For Nietzsche, judging life and its conditions according to the eternal and unchanging values is the typical characteristics of the weak and decadent types. The changing and unpredictable character of the physical world scares and horrifies the weak. They treat change as a threat to their life, and, instead of welcoming changing world and trying to interpret it so as to increase their power, they stick to those interpretations of the world, which, so far, preserved their species by denying the changing character of the world. Hence, to judge the world according to eternal truths and values, which belong to the world of being, is the very forte of the weak and decadent ones. “What kind of man reflects in this way?” asks Nietzsche, “[a]n unproductive, suffering kind, a kind weary of life.”³⁶⁹ However, a strong and courageous one welcomes this changing world as a stimulant to life and increases his power through exploiting the new possibilities resulting from the changing character of the world. Instead of limiting life and its possibilities through the distinction between real and apparent world, the strong ones accept this world and life as it is, and challenge all the dangers of the physical world stemming from its chaotic character. As Nietzsche says “[a] creature overloaded and *playing* with force would call precisely the affects, irrationality, and change good in a eudaemonistic sense, together with their consequences: danger, contrast, perishing, etc.”³⁷⁰ Actually, for him, this is the way, perhaps the only one, through which we could exploit the physical world for increasing and enhancing our power. Welcoming chaos of the world and challenging its dangers are Nietzsche’s advices for us about how to live; “the secret of harvesting from existence the greatest fruitfulness and the great enjoyment is—to *live dangerously!*”³⁷¹

Consequently, the distinction between the real and the apparent world is only a fiction, a perspectival interpretation of the world. Both the real and the apparent world are apparent in the sense that both have nothing to do with the world in which we live. That is, there is neither a real nor an apparent world;

³⁶⁹ WP, §585, p. 317.

³⁷⁰ WP, §576, pp. 310-11.

³⁷¹ GS, §283, p. 228.

these notions are produced by us and we have imposed this fiction upon the only world that we have. We invented a stable and predictable world out of the chaotic world of becoming; firstly, we have created an apparent world by interpreting and falsifying the physical world; afterwards, as there are change, suffering, death, deception, etc. in this apparent world, we have created a true and eternally stable world, into which we have transferred all the things that facilitates our preservation in the chaotic physical world. Since this dualistic world view facilitated our preservation, we regard it as truth, as reality. Hence, ironically, the real world, which is created by a lie, becomes a truthful world that does not deceive us. Nietzsche has nothing to say against creating such fictions, since it is a necessity for a living entity to maintain its existence. In a fragment, which is, according to Kaufmann, a draft of the preface for the new edition of *The Birth of Tragedy*, Nietzsche says that

there is only *one* world, and this is false, cruel, contradictory, seductive, without meaning—A world thus constituted is the real world. *We have need of lies* in order to conquer this reality, this “truth,” that is, in order to *live*—that lies are necessary in order to live itself is part of the terrifying and questionable character of existence.³⁷²

What Nietzsche rejects is the sublimation and deification of such fictions by positing them as eternal and the most valuable truths. Sticking to such truths and values is inimical to life and its values. Life is a process of continuous interpretation on the part of every power quanta, and the world is the totality of these interpretations. Every interpretation is valuation and evaluation of other power centers made from the perspective of power increase. Hence, judging, or interpreting life in accordance with the values that are eternal and unchanging is the sign of a weak will to power. Only weak and coward ones interpret the world in such a way, and only they would be willing to accept such a castrated and poor world. Thus, the real and apparent world distinction is only a perspectival interpretation; in reality there is no such distinction; there are no such distinct

³⁷² WP, §853, p. 451. For Kaufmann’s explanation of the fragment’s being a draft of the preface of BT, see n. 161 in WP.

worlds as real and apparent; we have only one world, and it is the one, in which we live and it is the one which create by our actions as active power centers.

3.8 Causality

Causality is the last major perspectival interpretation, or falsification, of the world that will be investigated in this chapter. For Nietzsche, causality is one of the main concepts that we use for establishing a stable and predictable world order. By the help of causality, we remove instability and irregularity from the world; we either deny the existence of those irregular events and entities or we make them look regular by inventing other fictitious events and entities to embrace them in the causal chain. Hence, it has a very crucial function in constructing a world that would preserve and maintain our existence. However, causality is rejected by Nietzsche as being a fiction created by us; as a perspectival interpretation.

Before going into details of Nietzsche's denial of the existence of causality in the world, I want to present his thoughts concerning the origin of the notion of causality in connection with the subject-object distinction. Because, in my opinion, this will help us to understand Nietzsche's view that causality is a perspectival interpretation.

According to Nietzsche, at the basis of our belief in causality, there lies our belief in the subject-object distinction. This belief, as we have seen in our discussion of Nietzsche's denial of the subject-object distinction, comes from our separation of doer from deed, which leads us to further separation of an event into the doer, the deed, and the object. This separation implies that every event, as an effect, presupposes an agent, or a subject, as its cause; that is, without an active agent there would be no events. Hence, when we try to understand an event, we apply these distinctions and try to define the subject, the object and the act of the event. As soon as we discern these components of the event, we attribute action or deed to the subject as its intentional activity so that the effect becomes a result of subject's intention. This understanding of events and the world, as in the case of other perspectival falsifications, becomes an absolute truth for us, since it works and helps us in preservation. Therefore, we believe

that there is causal necessity in the world, and we believe also that if we find out the necessary causal relations in the occurrence of an event then we completely comprehend the event. This belief leads us to apply this pattern to every event whether it is physical or mental.

However, from where do we acquire the notion of causality? As Nietzsche notes, we could not acquire it from experience; at most, experience provides us with a sequence of events that seem to follow each other. Yet, we cannot experience the necessity that we find in the notion of causality. That is, experience could not give the necessary relation between the cause and effect; experience could not give us the knowledge that when the event *x* occurs it is necessarily followed by the event *y*. According to Nietzsche, we derive this necessary causal relation from our inner experience. We, as intentional and willing subjects, believe that the movements of our bodies are results of our will; that is, I interpret the movement of my arms in the following way: I willed to move my arm then my arm has moved. This fact, as in the case of Descartes' *cogito*, seems to us as an obvious fact; as a fact which I could not doubt. As Nietzsche says, "[w]e believed ourselves to be causal in the act of willing: we thought that here at least we caught causality in the act."³⁷³ Hence, we do not doubt that there is a causal relation between our will and our acts and thoughts. Believing the truth of this inner causality we observe in our inner world, although we never experience it in the outer world we apply this causality. In other words, "[w]e have absolutely no experience of a cause; psychologically considered, we derive the entire concept from the conviction that *we* are causes, namely, that the arm moves."³⁷⁴ However, for Nietzsche, this is an error based on the above mentioned erroneous distinction between the doer and the deed; "[w]e separate ourselves, the doers, from the deed, and we make use of this pattern everywhere—we seek a doer for every event."³⁷⁵ This shows us how strongly the fundamental assumptions of the Western metaphysics, i.e., logic, the distinction

³⁷³ TI, "The Four Great Errors" §3, p. 494.

³⁷⁴ WP, §551, p. 295.

³⁷⁵ WP, §551, p. 295.

between subject-object and that between real and apparent world, and causality, are connected with each other, and how Nietzsche's critique or denial of one of them is necessarily involves the denial and the critique of the others. Nietzsche, by showing the perspectival, and also the provisional, character of these assumptions, undermines Western metaphysics.

Nietzsche's placing of the origin of causality in the subject, as constructed out of the distinctions of subject-object and doer-deed, is completely in accord with his perspectivism. In the sense that there is no causality either in the physical outer world or in the inner world of the subject, yet it is the subject, as a power center, that imposes causality on both worlds. That is, the subject interprets the world as being a causally related unity, in which case the world becomes a livable place; i.e., predictable, calculable, etc. Hence, as in the case that we need to construct a stable and predictable world, the notion of causality is another perspectival interpretation of the world.

Nietzsche sees the notion of causality as the way to secure that the world is a familiar place. When we are faced with events and entities that are strange and unfamiliar, we feel scared and try to make them familiar. As Nietzsche states, our first respond in such situations is to get rid of them by explaining their causes in terms of familiar and known concepts or entities. "With the unknown, one is confronted with danger, discomfort, and care; the first instinct is to abolish these painful states. First principle: any explanation is better than none."³⁷⁶ In such a condition of distress, he notes, we are not concerned with the truth of our explanation, but its utility for life; we try to get rid of such painful states by choosing that explanation which worked well before and which would give the quickest relief without considering its truth concerning the actual state of the world. Therefore, relief from conditions of distress and pain, or pleasure in general, becomes our criterion for truth. Hence, our search for causality in the physical world is "conditional upon, and excited by, the feeling of fear."³⁷⁷ On this ground, Nietzsche rejects Kant's view of causality as a category (of relation).

³⁷⁶ TI, "The Four Great Errors" §5, p. 497.

³⁷⁷ TI, "The Four Great Errors" §5, p. 497.

Kant, agreeing with Hume, believes that experience cannot give us the notion of causality; yet, departing from Hume, he claims that causality is one of those *a priori* categories of our understanding, which make experience possible.³⁷⁸ For him, causality, as well as space and time, are the conditions or the possibilities of experience. In the “Second Analogy” of his *Critique of Pure Reason*, for example, Kant presents this crucial role of the causality in the following way: “Experience itself—in other words, empirical knowledge of appearances—is thus possible only in so far as we subject the succession of appearances, and therefore all alteration, to the law of causality; and, as likewise follows, the appearances, as objects of experience, are themselves possible only in conformity with the law.”³⁷⁹ However, for Nietzsche, there is no such an *a priori* category of understanding, and all of our categories of reason are mere

³⁷⁸ Kant’s understanding of causality and his responses to Hume’s critique of the notion of causality are very complex. For the sake of the present study, I will not go into the details of these issues. I will only concentrated upon Nietzsche’s critiques of the concept of causality, and where his critiques necessitates an appeal to Kant’s and Hume’s views concerning causality I will try to limit my concern with the point to which Nietzsche directs his critiques.

³⁷⁹ Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Norman Kemp Smith, New York: Macmillan, 1965, B234, p. 219. Actually, Kant’s view that the law of causality is the condition of experience is his application of the transcendental proof as an alternative method of proof. Whereas, for Hume, all the objects of human reasoning are either *relations of ideas*, which are “discoverable by the mere operation of thought, without dependence on what is anywhere existent in the universe,” or matters *of fact*, which are demonstrable through observation and experience. (David Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Tom L. Beauchamp, New York: Oxford University Press, 2006, (Section 4, Part I), p. 24) Relations of ideas are analytical concepts or truths, and it is impossible to claim the validity of their opposite without falling into a deep contradiction. However, in the case of matters of fact, since the only way to demonstrate their truth is to appeal experience and observation, and their opposite could be claimed or thought without contradiction. Hence, for Hume, the law of causality, which is a matter of fact, could not be demonstrated or proved by appealing these two methods; neither by “the mere operation of thought” nor by the experience. That is, it is not possible to demonstrate the truth or falsity of the law of causality through these methods. So far, Kant agrees with Hume, yet, he claims that there is another, third, way of proof; that is, *transcendental proof*. Such proofs depend on the possibility of experience. That is, for Kant, to prove the existence of causality, in this method, we must show that causality is required for the possibility of our experience of the world. Simply put, according to Kant, if there is no law of causality operative in the world of phenomena, or appearances, then there is no way to secure the objective validity of my perceptions that sequentially follow one another. These successive perceptions, or the sequential structure of my perceptions, might be illusions, in which case we could not speak of empirical knowledge. “Thus the relation of appearances (as possible perceptions) according to which the subsequent event, that which happens, is, as to its existence, necessarily determined in time by something preceding in conformity with a rule—in other words, the relation of cause to effect—is the condition of the objective validity of our empirical judgments, in respect of the series of perceptions, and so of their empirical truth; that is to say, it is the condition of experience.” (Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, B247, p. 227.)

perspectival interpretations; they are invented by us to preserve ourselves by providing us with a quick understanding of the world. “The inventive force that invented categories,” says Nietzsche, “labored in the service of our needs, namely of our need for security, for quick understanding on the basis of signs and sounds, for means of abbreviation:—‘substance,’ ‘subject,’ ‘object,’ ‘being,’ ‘becoming’ have nothing to do with metaphysical truths.”³⁸⁰ Hence, the category of causality is nothing but another illusion that facilitates life, and thinking of the world as constituting a causal connected unity is nothing but to render what is unfamiliar and terrifying.

There is no such thing as a sense of causality, as Kant thinks. One is surprised, one is disturbed, one desires something familiar to hold on to—As soon as we are shown something old in the new, we are calmed. The supposed instinct for causality is only fear of the unfamiliar and the attempt to discover something familiar in it—a search, not for causes, but for the familiar.³⁸¹

Nietzsche, rejecting Kant’s notion of causality as what makes experience possible, claims that what we sense is nothing but a series of events following each other; there is nothing of necessity in those series that compels events to follow each other in a regular way. According to Nietzsche, “[f]rom the fact that something ensues regularly and ensues calculably, it does not follow that it ensues *necessarily*.”³⁸² Since, as we know, the world is the totality of the power struggles among the power centers, and every power center is determined through this struggle. This determination is not the result of obeying a law, but the result of the struggle. As Nietzsche puts it

[t]he unalterable sequence of certain phenomena demonstrates no “law” but a power relationship between two or more forces. To say “But this relation itself remains constant” is to say no more than “One and the same force cannot also be another force.”—It is a question, not of succession, but of

³⁸⁰ WP, §513, p. 277.

³⁸¹ WP, §551, p. 297.

³⁸² WP, §552, p. 297.

interpretation, a process in which the individual successive moments are not related to one another as cause effect—³⁸³

Hence, the necessity involved in the law of causality is only a fiction; that is, “[n]ecessity is not a fact but an interpretation.”³⁸⁴ Thus, Kant’s positing of the causality as an *a priori* category of understanding is nothing but an interpretation, which aims at ensuring that the physical or the outer world is an ordered and predictable unity. However, as the above quotations suggests, if we could speak of the law of causality, then we could speak of it only as an *a posteriori* concept, not as an *a priori* concept, or a category of understanding. That is, we attain the concept of causality only after we have perceived events and entities in the physical world. We perceive the events in the physical world, which seem so chaotic to maintain our existence, and construct a well-ordered and predictable world by interpreting those events through causality and other useful fictions. Furthermore, when the utility of causality is proven, we regard it as an *a priori* category. Hence, causality, as well as other useful fictions, becomes an indispensable part of our cognitive mechanism.

[T]he categories of reason: they could have prevailed, after much groping and fumbling, through their relative utility—There came a point when one collected them together, raised them to consciousness as a whole—and when one commanded them, i.e., when they had the effect of a command—From then on, they counted as *a priori*, as beyond experience, as irrefutable. And yet perhaps they represent nothing more than the expediency of a certain race and species—their utility alone is their “truth”—³⁸⁵

Therefore, causality becomes a paradigmatic explanatory tool, and we believe that we explain an event when we succeed in situating it in a causal sequence. However, for Nietzsche, to analyze an event in terms of causality does not provide us with the explanation of the event, but with a mere description of it. First of all, in order for us to apply causality as an explanatory principle we

³⁸³ WP, §631, p. 336.

³⁸⁴ WP, §552, p. 297. Similarly, in WP §711, Nietzsche says “‘necessity,’ ‘causality,’ ‘purposiveness’ are useful unrealities.” (p. 379)

³⁸⁵ WP, §515, p. 278.

should conceive the events as events in themselves. That is, to discern the cause and the effect in an event, it should be completed. Only after the event is completed and we see the result, or the effect, we could find the cause of that event by reversing the time. Cause, which comes first in the order of cause-effect relation, is produced by us according to the effect we experience. “In fact,” says Nietzsche, “we invent all causes after the schema of the effect: the latter is known to us—Conversely, we are not in a position to predict of any thing what it will ‘effect.’”³⁸⁶ Without seeing the effect we could not speak of the cause, or as Nietzsche puts it, “[b]efore the effect one believes in different causes than one does afterward.”³⁸⁷ Hence, applying causality as an explanatory principle requires that the event should be present to us as an event-in-itself; that is, event should be completed. However, such an event is only possible in the world of being, not of becoming; in a world where becoming reigns, there, we could never see a completed event. As we know, for Nietzsche, the world, in which we live, is the world of becoming, or the world of dynamic power quanta, thus, in this world, there is no point of time, in which we could speak of a completed event without falsifying that world. “Cause and effect,” says Nietzsche, “such a duality probably never exists; in truth we are confronted by a continuum out of which we isolate a couple of pieces, just as we perceive motion only as isolated points and then infer it without actually seeing it.”³⁸⁸ Then, what we do by causal interpretations could never be an explanation of the event; at most, it could be a description of the event in terms of the imaginary but familiar things and entities. Nietzsche says the following concerning the possibility of explanation through causality: “. . . how could we possibly explain anything? We operate only with things that do not exist: lines, planes, bodies, atoms, divisible time spans, divisible space.”³⁸⁹ Therefore, causality appears as another fiction which complements our illusionary world view by providing us with a law that secures

³⁸⁶ WP, §551, p. 296.

³⁸⁷ GS, §217, p. 210. Also see, TI, “The Four Great Errors” §4, p. 496, and HAH, vol. I, §13, pp. 17-19.

³⁸⁸ GS, §112, p. 173.

³⁸⁹ GS, §112, p. 172.

our world of being and the changes that occur in it. In other words, we create a stable and predictable world through applying logic, subject-object and apparent-real world distinctions, and other subsequent concepts following them; yet, although we believe in the stability of this world, there appear changes in this world; thus, to secure the stability of this illusory world, these changes are presented as occurring in accordance with a law, namely the law of causality.

Consequently, for Nietzsche, all of our eternal and honorable truths, beliefs, and values, including causality, logic, subject-object and apparent-real world distinctions, are perspectival illusions and nothing more; they are only our “human, all too human,” interpretations of the world, and they have no value other than their value for our survival. Through his perspectivism, Nietzsche tries to show the provisional character of our truths. As we have seen, his perspectivism is based on his doctrine of the will to power. That is, perspectivism could be seen as the explanation of the way in which a power quantum or center perceives and understands the world and its environment. We know that, to Nietzsche, every existing entity in the world is simply will to power, and as wills to power they search ceaselessly after power. Therefore, every power center, whether as a quantum or a constellation, struggles with every other power center for power, even to the extent of self-sacrifice. As we have seen earlier, according to Nietzsche, self-preservation is a side-effect of this power struggle, not its aim.³⁹⁰

The concept of power struggle is very important for Nietzsche and his philosophy. Since the world is nothing but the totality of the power struggle of the power centers. Through this struggle every power quanta determines each other reciprocally. Actually, this determination process is interpretation. That is, each power center involves in the power struggle and interprets each other through its own perspective; interpretation is a process of actively shaping, structuring, determining and assimilating the envioning conditions and the world to create the conditions of preservation and power enhancement. If a power center’s interpretation of the world results in an increase in its power it is

³⁹⁰ See, Chapter 2.3.

a good (true) interpretation, otherwise it is a bad (false) interpretation. In both cases, there appears a change in the environment, hence a new interpretation is required. Thus the process of interpretation lasts forever. For Nietzsche, every power center lusts for power, it is this lust for power that determines the nature and direction of its interpretations. This lust for power is the perspective that guides the interpretation process. Hence, all power centers, including us humans as complex power centers, interpret, i.e., shape, structure, determine and assimilate, the world through this perspective.

This is the core of Nietzsche's perspectivism; we, human beings, are power centers and our honored and the strongly believed truths and values are only the ways through which we structure the world according to requirements of our preservation and enhancement, yet we stick to them and take them as eternal truths. Hence, one interpretation of the world, among the countless possible ones, accepted as the only true interpretation of the world, for Nietzsche, becomes an insurmountable obstacle to the further development and enhancement of our life. Those fundamental assumptions of the Western metaphysics, such as, logic, causality, and apparent-real world and subject-object distinctions, are such perspectival interpretations.

According to Nietzsche, all of these fundamental assumptions and other subsequent assumptions following them are based on a stable and predictable world order. That is, their validity, or reality is dependent upon the existence of an unchanging and well-ordered world structure. On the other hand, such a stable world order is possible only on the condition that these assumptions must be valid, or real. Hence, there appears a vicious circle: in order to prove that the world in which we live is stable and predictable it must be shown that the entities and events in this world behave or act in accordance with the rules and laws derived from those fundamental assumptions; yet, to prove that these rules and laws are real, or they really exist, it must be shown that the world is stable and predictable. Since assuming the stability of the world provides us with conditions of our survival, we do not recognize or bother about the circularity of such reasoning, or the implications of the stability of the world assumption and our

cognitive mechanisms for maintaining this stable world understanding. Put differently, our conception of the world as stable and predictable and our cognitive mechanisms and tools are interdependent fictions and there is no way to prove either of them without appealing to the other, but such a proof leads to a vicious circle, and thus these fictions could not be accepted as corresponding to the nature of the world. According to Nietzsche, one may claim that they are true since they work and preserve our existence in the world; yet, for him, preservation of man could not be accepted as a proof. Hence, what we have is nothing but an illusory stable world and fictitious laws and rules that supports and works within this world.

Nietzsche is not against such fictions; he admits the necessity of creating such fictions for the preservation and enhancement of any species or any individual. However, he is against sticking to such fictions. Since the world is in a ceaseless flux, it presents us with infinite opportunities for our preservation and enhancement. To exploit these opportunities, we must be aware of the provisional character of our truths and beliefs, and we must also be open to new interpretations of the world. Otherwise, if we accept an interpretation as eternally true, and base our life on it, then we could not exploit other opportunities presented by the world. Thus, we live an impoverished life, even without noticing other possibilities of life. It is this consequence of the stable world view that Nietzsche harshly criticized. For him, it is the weak ones who defend and accept such a world view as the reality, since believing it maintains their existence; yet a richer and fuller life, or increasing power, requires risking one's life. Consequently, we can say that Nietzsche's perspectivism should not be understood as a mere epistemological theory. It makes new ways of conceiving the world in which we live possible, and also leads to a richer and fuller life.

CHAPTER IV

TRUTH AND CORRESPONDENCE THEORY

In the preceding two chapters, we have explored the fundamentals of Nietzsche's epistemology: his construction of the world as becoming through the doctrine of will to power and his perspectivism. We have gained an insight into his general criticism of our traditional conceptualization of the world as the world of being and our traditional metaphysical assumptions about this world. Now, it is time to proceed to Nietzsche's notion of truth, which is the most controversial part of his epistemology; it is controversial, since, in his writings there are conflicting passages concerning the value and the existence of truth. Although, throughout preceding chapters, we have dealt briefly with this concept, we have not thoroughly explored it. What does Nietzsche mean by truth? Does his conception of truth fall under one of the traditional or widely accepted categories of truth; i.e., correspondence, coherence, or pragmatic theories of truth? These questions are the most frequently discussed questions among the contemporary Nietzsche scholars.³⁹¹ Now, let us try to answer these questions under the light of the preceding presentation of his perspectivism.

4.1 Nietzsche's Concept of Truth

Nietzsche's thoughts about truth seem so conflicting that anyone skimming through his writings may easily conclude that his philosophy is a philosophy of hopeless contradictions. It is easy to find many passages in which he seems to accept and praise truth, whereas it is also very easy to find passages in which he seems to deny and despise truth. To illustrate, he praises truth by saying that

³⁹¹ Maybe, this is due to the fact that more and more analytically oriented scholars have directed their attention to the philosophy of Nietzsche.

[a]t every step one has to wrestle for truth; one has had to surrender for it almost everything to which the heart, to which our love, our trust in life, cling otherwise. That requires greatness of soul: the service of truth is the hardest service.³⁹²

. . . *our* treasure is where the beehives of our knowledge are.³⁹³

Furthermore, Nietzsche praises those who

have trained themselves to sacrifice all desirability to truth, *every* truth, even plain, harsh, ugly, repellent, unchristian, immoral truth.—For such truths do exist.³⁹⁴

On the other hand, one may easily find lots of passages in which Nietzsche denies the possibility of attaining truth, and also in which he demises the concept truth. To illustrate,

Truths are illusions which we have forgotten are illusions . . .³⁹⁵

We simply lack any organ for knowledge, for “truth”; we “know” (or believe or imagine) just as much may be *useful* in the interest of the human herd, the species . . .³⁹⁶

Truth is the kind of error without which a certain species of life could not live.³⁹⁷

What are man’s truths ultimately? Merely his *irrefutable* errors.³⁹⁸

“Truth”: this, according to my way of thinking, does not necessarily denote the antithesis of error, but in the most fundamental cases only the posture of various errors in relation to one another.³⁹⁹

³⁹² A, §50, p. 632,

³⁹³ GM, preface §1, p. 15.

³⁹⁴ GM, I, §1, p. 25.

³⁹⁵ TL, p. 84.

³⁹⁶ GS, §354, p. 300.

³⁹⁷ WP, §493, p. 272.

³⁹⁸ GS, §265, p. 219.

³⁹⁹ WP, §535, p. 290.

As it is clear from the above quotations, Nietzsche may appear to be in a very deep contradiction on the issues of truth and knowledge. It is this seemingly obvious, *prima facie*, contradiction that gives rise to various incompatible and conflicting interpretations concerning the Nietzsche's views about truth and knowledge. According to Clark, at the basis of these conflicting interpretations there lie the Nietzsche scholars' approaches to the contradiction in Nietzsche's thoughts about truth. She mentions that there are two possible approaches to this contradiction; one is to deny the existence of it and try to show that it is merely an apparent contradiction; and the other alternative is to accept the existence of the contradiction and to argue that we could learn something about truth from it.⁴⁰⁰ If I am to choose one of them as my position, I would choose the first one without hesitation. Since, in my opinion, there is no contradiction in Nietzsche's views concerning truth.

We have already seen some of the controversial aspects of Nietzsche's notion of truth in our discussion of his perspectivism; especially, the self-contradiction stemming from his denial of truth; if his claim that there is no truth is true, then, there is at least one truth.⁴⁰¹ However, we have also seen that when we evaluate his denial of truth in accordance not with our traditional conception of truth, which is based on a static world-view, but with his criterion of truth, which depends on the dynamic world of power quanta, the accusation of self-contradiction becomes meaningless. Remember that Nietzsche's criterion for truth was the enhancement of power: if any belief or idea enhances my power it is true, otherwise it is false. Such a view of truth does not involve the concept of

⁴⁰⁰ See, Clark, p. 4. Clark names the first group of interpretations as *traditional* and the second group as *non-traditional*. She further divides these groups into subgroups in accordance with the truth theory attributed to Nietzsche. While finding this grouping very plausible, I am not going to concentrate on this division. Focusing on the traditional and nontraditional division and proceeding upon this division is strategically not suitable for my purposes. In my opinion, proceeding with the attributed theories of truth, or dividing the interpretations in accordance with the truth theories is much more beneficial than Clark's division. Because, when put together under the title of the attributed truth theories, the contrast between the traditional and nontraditional interpretations becomes much more clear. For a more detailed grouping of the scholars according to the theories they attributed to Nietzsche, see Christoph Cox, *Nietzsche: Naturalism and Interpretation*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999, pp. 28-29, n. 17.

⁴⁰¹ See, Chapter 3.4.

contradiction and absolute truth, since a belief might both be true and false at the same time for different individuals. Furthermore, truth or falsity of a belief might also change in the course of time; i.e., a belief that enhanced my power in the past might be in contradiction with the one that enhances my power now. As we have already dealt with this issue,⁴⁰² I will proceed with the contradictions resulting from his affirmative and negative statements regarding truth.

In his affirmative statements about truth, Nietzsche refers to the truth in accordance with his criterion of truth. Through his criterion of truth, Nietzsche emphasizes the provisional character of truth. That is, all of our beliefs and ideas must be taken as true in so far as they enhance our power. This means that there are no absolute truths that would enhance our power and life eternally. Since the world of power quanta is dynamic and an ever-changing one, truths concerning it must be dynamic too. As we have seen in our discussion of perspectivism and interpretation, every change in the world requires new and fresh interpretations, and every new interpretation means a change in the world.⁴⁰³ Therefore, clinging to the traditional conception of truth, which regards truth as absolute and correspondence to the reality, is not favorable with regard to enhancement of power. As Nietzsche says, “[i]n a world that is essentially false, truthfulness would be an antinatural tendency.”⁴⁰⁴ Since, such a tendency degrades life; it prevents us from becoming aware of, and exploiting, the infinite possibilities of the world.

On the other hand, what Nietzsche praises in those statements concerning truth is the perspectival truth; i.e., one that does not demand correspondence, and is not absolute. This conception of truth requires that one must have the courage of denying the formerly useful truths, i.e., that preserved and enhanced our lives, for the sake of further enhancement of power. Such a denial or abandonment means to risk one’s life. Yet, for Nietzsche, this task is too hard even for the most courageous ones, since it is an ever-continuing one. Thus, he avers that

⁴⁰² See, Chapter 3.4.

⁴⁰³ See, Chapter 3.2.

⁴⁰⁴ WP, §543, p. 292.

“[e]ven the most courageous among us only rarely has the courage for that which he really knows.”⁴⁰⁵ Truths that are praised by him in those affirmative statements are fully compatible with his doctrine of the will to power and his perspectival epistemology. The following passage, in which Nietzsche makes a reckoning of his life at his forties, strikingly expresses his thoughts concerning the above mentioned risking life for the sake of knowledge and truth:

In media vita [in mid-life].—No, life has not disappointed me. On the contrary, I find it truer, more desirable and mysterious every year—ever since the day when the great liberator came to me: the idea that life could be an experiment of the seeker for knowledge—and not a duty, not a calamity, not trickery.—And knowledge itself: let it be something else for others; for example, a bed to rest on, or the way to such a bed, or a diversion, or a form of leisure—for me, it is a world of dangers and victories in which heroic feelings, too, find places to dance and play. “*Life as a means to knowledge*”—with this principle in one’s heart one can live not only boldly but even gaily, and laugh gaily, too. And who knows how to laugh anyway and live well if he does not first know a good deal about war and victory?⁴⁰⁶

There is no reason to claim that Nietzsche’s views concerning truths are contradictory, for he sometimes seems to be praising truth whereas sometimes he seems to be rejecting it as nonsense. As we have just seen, when he praises or speaks affirmatively about truth he refers to the truth, which is compatible with his doctrine of the will to power and perspectivism. On the other hand, when Nietzsche speaks in a negative manner about truth, he always refers to the traditional conception of truth, namely, correspondence theory of truth, which regards truth as the correspondence to the facts, and which takes truths as absolute.

Nietzsche’s rejection of the absolute truth and the correspondence as the criterion of truth could be regarded as the natural consequence of his doctrine of will to power. That is, absolute truth and correspondence requires a world that is stable and changeless. Otherwise, in a world that is continuously changing, we

⁴⁰⁵ TI, “Maxims and Arrows,” §2, p. 466.

⁴⁰⁶ GS, §324, p. 255.

could not speak of absolute truth and correspondence of our beliefs, ideas, or propositions to the facts, or to the world. As we have seen, for Nietzsche, the world is a chaos resulting from the power struggle among the power centers. Hence, in the Nietzschean world of power quanta, correspondence as criterion of truth does not work; yet, if we still insist on applying it as a criterion of truth, we could never find a truth. Since, as we have seen while discussing perspectivism, our conception of the world as a stable and predictable unity is an illusion for Nietzsche, our truths judged by the criterion of correspondence, which is based on this stable world view, are also illusions and errors. This is what Nietzsche means when he denies our truths. Hence, the contradiction stemming from Nietzsche's affirmative and negative statements concerning truth becomes an apparent one.

After this brief explanation concerning the contradictions in Nietzsche's use of the concept of truth, I want to emphasize another important aspect of Nietzsche's notion of truth. Our traditional conception of truth is, as we have often noted, based on the stable world view, in which there are beings. Such a notion of truth assumes that truth is out there in the world of being, and our task is to discover it. However, for Nietzsche, as there is nothing stable in the world, as every power center determines, and is also determined by every other power center through power struggle, there is no such a truth in the world that is waiting to be found out; rather, in such a world, for Nietzsche, truth appears as something that is created by power centers in their struggle with each other.

“Truth” is . . . not something there, that might be found or discovered—but that must be created and that gives a name to process, or rather to a will to overcome that has in itself no end—introducing truth, as a *process in infinitum*, an active determining—not a becoming-conscious of something that is in itself firm and determined. It is a word for the “will to power.”⁴⁰⁷

What is presented here is simply the perspectivism is at work. That is, if we remember that every power center constructs its world by interpreting, i.e.,

⁴⁰⁷ WP, §552, p. 298.

assimilating, structuring, shaping, and imposing meaning, from the perspective of power increase, then, as the above passage suggests, through this process of interpretation, a power center also creates its own truth. Hence, perspectivism, or the perspectival interpretation, becomes the process of truth creation. This means that, since in the process of interpretation every power center determines and is determined by every other power center, every power center mutually determines, and hence becomes, every other's truth. However, since every power center is quantitatively different from each other, i.e., the degree of power of every power center is different, and since there are active and passive power centers, therefore, active and powerful centers are the ones who are most influential in this process of truth creation. These active power centers are those who would sacrifice their lives for the sake of power, for the sake of increasing their power. Because of this, for Nietzsche, truths created by these active power centers are more valuable than the passive ones; yet since the active and courageous ones only rarely appear and disappear soon, truth and values of the passive, weak, mediocre and cowards prevail.⁴⁰⁸ Nietzsche expresses his preference as follows:

Ultimately, man finds in things nothing but what he himself has imported into them: the finding is called science, the importing—art, religion, love, pride. Even this should be a piece of childishness, one should carry on with both and be well disposed toward both—some should find; others—*we* others!—should import!⁴⁰⁹

Consequently, as we have seen, Nietzsche's notion of truth is very different from our traditional notion of truth. This difference is the result of his construction of the world as becoming. This construction, leads him to reject the existence of absolute truths, and to declare that our truths are provisional.

⁴⁰⁸ “ . . . man as species is not progressing. Higher types indeed attained, but they do not last. The level of species is *not* raised . . . The richest and the most complex forms—for the expression ‘higher type’ means no more than this—perish more easily: only the lowest preserve an apparent indestructibility. The former are achieved only rarely and maintain their superiority with difficulty: the latter are favored by a compromising fruitfulness.” (WP, §684, p. 363.) See, also pp. 35-39.

⁴⁰⁹ WP, §606, p. 327.

Related with his construction of the world, Nietzsche rejects correspondence as a criterion of truth, and pronounces the enhancement of power, or the feeling of power as his criterion of truth. Another fundamental difference, again stemming from his notion of the world of becoming, is his view that truth not as something to be discovered, but as something to be actively created. These differences, in my opinion, mean the total destruction of our traditional cognitive paradigm, of our perception of the world and ourselves, and of our axiological systems based upon those truths accredited by our traditional understanding of the world.

However, most of Nietzsche scholars treat him as if there are no such differences, and try to categorize him by attributing a truth theory to his perspectivism. It seems to me that behind such attempts there is the aim of humanizing the *Übermensch*. Sticking a label over Nietzsche's philosophy is nothing but to judge his thoughts through what is ceaselessly rejected in his writings. To use the metaphor that Nietzsche uses in describing the way how our thinking process occurs, it is nothing but putting Nietzsche's thoughts to Procrustes' bed;⁴¹⁰ "In our thought," says Nietzsche, "the essential future is fitting new material into old schemas (=Procrustes' bed), *making* equal what is new."⁴¹¹

Let us, now, keeping these peculiarities and differences of Nietzsche's understanding of truth in our minds, investigate firstly his critique of the correspondence theory of truth, than, into the claims of those scholars who attribute correspondence theory of truth to his perspectivism.

⁴¹⁰ Procrustes, "also called Polypemon, Damastes, or Procoptas, in Greek legend, a robber dwelling somewhere in Attica—in some versions, in the neighbourhood of Eleusis. His father was said to be Poseidon. Procrustes had an iron bed (or, according to some accounts, two beds) on which he compelled his victims to lie. Here, if a victim was shorter than the bed, he stretched him by hammering or racking the body to fit. Alternatively, if the victim was longer than the bed, he cut off the legs to make the body fit the bed's length. In either event the victim died. Ultimately Procrustes was slain by his own method at the hands of the young Attic hero Theseus, who as a young man went about slaying robbers and monsters that pervaded the countryside. The "bed of Procrustes," or "Procrustean bed," has become proverbial for arbitrarily—and perhaps ruthlessly—forcing someone or something to fit into an unnatural scheme or pattern. ("Procrustes," In *Encyclopædia Britannica*, accessed December 25, 2006, from Encyclopædia Britannica Online: <http://search.eb.com/eb/article-9061475>).

⁴¹¹ WP, §499, p. 273.

4.2 Nietzsche and Correspondence Theory of Truth

The correspondence theory of truth is not a recently developed theory; it is the oldest truth theory that has been so far. It is usually traced back to Plato and Aristotle. It is Aristotle's following definition of truth which makes him the father of the correspondence theory of truth: "To say of what is that it is not, or of what is not that it is, is false, while to say of what is that it is, and of what is not that it is not, is true."⁴¹² The basic claim of the correspondence theory is that "truth is correspondence with the facts' or 'truth is agreement with reality.'"⁴¹³ That is, what we say, believe, or think is true on the condition that it corresponds to the external world. Such a correspondence requires a stable world order, which means that correspondence theory works only in the world of being, not of becoming. However, as we have seen, Nietzsche's world is that of becoming and excludes correspondence. Nietzsche's main critique of correspondence proceeds on this ground, and we have already touched upon this issue in Chapter 3. However, it is not the only critique that Nietzsche directed to the correspondence theory; he further criticizes this theory for its self-contradictory nature.

The correspondence theory of truth requires that there must be correspondence between our thoughts and the reality out there. However, this criterion of truth assumes that we are able to compare our thoughts and the external reality from the outside. In other words, to determine the degree of correspondence between a thought, a belief, or an idea and a fact in the external world there must be a transcendent vantage point from which our belief, or our cognitive act and the external fact, or the content of our cognition, which is supposed to correspond, could be seen as they are in themselves. This means that we do not need to apply correspondence as a criterion of truth, since we have direct access to the external world as it is in itself. Hence, we could attain true knowledge of the fact, and this knowledge transcends the correspondence as a criterion; i.e., we need not to employ correspondence as a criterion for evaluating

⁴¹² Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, (Book IV, Chapter 7), p. 122.

⁴¹³ Richard L. Kirkham, "Truth, Correspondence Theory of," in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Version 1.0, London and New York: Routledge, 1998.

truth of our knowledge since it is obviously true. We could only have our human perspective to determine the degree of correspondence; hence, whether such a vantage exists or not, we could not access to it. Even if we suppose that we may have access to that vantage, as Nietzsche's perspectivism implies, we always look from our perspective, which means that we fall into an infinite regress. That is to say, in that case, we would be appealing to our own perspective to determine the adequacy of the correspondence between our perspective and the world. Yet, as we appeal to our perspective to determine if our perspective corresponds to the world, we should again determine the degree of correspondence between our second perspective and the correspondence between our first perspective and the world, and so on. Consequently, correspondence could not be verified by applying to itself as criterion. Nietzsche's critique of the intellect's capacity to criticize itself carries the same tone: ". . . is it likely that a tool is *able* to criticize its own fitness?"⁴¹⁴ asks Nietzsche, and answers in the following way:

The intellect cannot criticize itself, simply because it cannot be compared with other species of intellect and because its capacity to know would be revealed only in the presence of "true reality," i.e., because in order to criticize the intellect we should have to be a higher being with "absolute knowledge." This presupposes that, distinct from every perspective kind of outlook or sensual-spiritual appropriation, something exists, an "in-itself."—But the psychological derivation of the belief in things forbids us to speak of "things-in-themselves."⁴¹⁵

Nietzsche's criterion of truth does not fall into such a regressive circularity. Because it could be applied to itself without contradicting, or violating, the very thing it proclaims. That is, unlike the criterion of

⁴¹⁴ WP, §410, p. 221.

⁴¹⁵ WP, §473, p. 263. Nietzsche's critique of Kant for his investigation into the nature of knowledge without questioning its existence in *Critique of Pure Reason* follows this line of reasoning. Consider the following: "The *proton pseudos* [First falsehood or original error]: how is the fact of knowledge possible? is knowledge a fact at all? what is knowledge? If we do not know what knowledge is, we cannot possibly answer the question whether there is knowledge.—Very well! But if I do not already 'know' whether there is knowledge, whether there can be knowledge, I cannot reasonably put the question 'what is knowledge?' Kant *believes* in the fact of knowledge: what he wants is a piece of naiveté: knowledge of knowledge." (WP, §530, p. 286.)

correspondence, his criterion of the increase in the feeling of power could be determined without appealing to anything, i.e., to a vantage, outside the power center. In order to test whether a belief of mine increases or decreases my feeling of power I do not need to test my feelings by, or with regard to, an external measure. Further, Nietzsche's criterion is compatible with his dynamic world view, as our truths are interpretations they change according to the changes occurring in the world, and as such continue to increase our power. However, if we insist on using the correspondence theory of truth in this world of becoming, we could never find a truth; in such a situation what we regard as truths, which are verified by the correspondence criterion, would be mere illusions. This is what Nietzsche means when calls our truths as illusions.

4.2.1 Is the Correspondence Theory of Truth Inherent in Nietzsche's Perspectivism?

Correspondence theory of truth is the most common label used for Nietzsche's perspectivism. It is very interesting to see again that Nietzsche is accused of having the very thing which he ceaselessly rejected or opposed, as in the case of Heidegger's and Richardson's claims about a Nietzschean metaphysics.⁴¹⁶ The tendency to attribute a truth theory to Nietzsche, actually, seems to have been increasing after analytical philosophy had dominated the academic philosophy throughout the world. This domination of analytical philosophy resulted in the (almost) total rejection and degradation of the continental philosophy and the philosophers belonging to that tradition.⁴¹⁷ Under the influence of analytical tradition, which requires clarity and well-formed arguments as the criteria of

⁴¹⁶ See, Chapters 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

⁴¹⁷ Since analytical philosophy, imitating sciences, aims at certainty and clarity in its analyses, whereas continental philosophy tends to make the problems, which it inquires, more complicated through its openness to sustained inquiry. That is, analytical philosophy either solves or dissolves the problems, which it analyzes, yet, continental philosophy inquires the problems again and again, without reaching a certain and clear answer or solution. Because of this, analytical philosophy and continental philosophy seem to be opposed to each other. For an interesting viewpoint concerning the relation between analytical and continental philosophy, see Babette E. Babich, "On the Analytic-Continental Divide in Philosophy: Nietzsche's Lying Truth, Heidegger's Speaking Language, and Philosophy," in *A House Divided: Comparing Analytic and Continental Philosophy*, ed. C. G. Prado, New York: Humanity Books, 2003, pp. 63-103

doing good philosophy, contemporary Nietzsche scholars started to investigate into his philosophy employing logical, or linguistic, analysis. Regarding truth as a matter simply of language and of meaning, these scholars concentrated only upon only those parts of Nietzsche's conception of truth that are linguistically analyzable. That is, most of the original and critical parts of his philosophy remain outside of the concerns of the analytically oriented scholars, who seem to have misunderstood Nietzsche. As Babich rightly notes, "analytic philosophers typically take only as much as they can 'stand' from Nietzsche, not puzzling over but instead (this is the analytic tactic) dismissing the rest as unsupportable . . . to test Nietzsche's philosophy, not only his own complicated terms, but on the standards of logical exigence or the received discourses of the day leaves Nietzsche lacking."⁴¹⁸ In my opinion, this tendency to take only those parts which could be handled within the boundaries of analytical philosophy is the reason why they attribute a truth theory to Nietzsche.

Furthermore, it is very interesting to see that the number of the analytically oriented scholars, who have been dealing with Nietzsche increases. It is interesting because Nietzsche maybe the most difficult philosopher to be studied with the tools of analytical philosophy; since his thoughts are not so clear and distinct to apply logical or linguistic analysis; Nietzsche rejects language's capacity to express any truth, or reality, because of the metaphysics inherent in it, rejects logic and its principles as a tool for finding truth, praises contradictions as the implication of the richness of thoughts, etc. One possible answer to this concern of analytic philosophers with Nietzsche maybe the following observation of Kaufmann: "it is plain how often professors have dealt with Nietzsche because he was fashionable and the students were reading him. But most professors also want to be respectable. In the United States, beginning in the 1960s, that meant assimilating Nietzsche to analytic philosophy, while in

⁴¹⁸ Babich, "On the Analytic-Continental Divide in Philosophy," p. 83. Babich's article, not only elaborates the differences between the approaches of the analytic and the continental traditions to philosophical issues, but also to the reception of Nietzsche's philosophy, especially his conception of truth, by the analytic tradition and the influence of this reception over the continental tradition's reception of Nietzsche.

Germany it meant for a long time being Kantian.”⁴¹⁹ Whether this observation is true or not, it is clear that, among analytic philosophers—Maudemarie Clark, Robert Nola, John Richardson, Bernd Magnus, Arthur C. Danto, Brian Leiter, and Richard Schacht, to name some of them—there has been a tendency towards Nietzsche’s philosophy. Moreover, it is also clear that most of the analytical philosophers dealing with Nietzsche attributed a truth theory to Nietzsche: Clark and Richardson attributed correspondence theory, Nola both correspondence and pragmatic theories, Danto pragmatic theory.⁴²⁰

I want to concentrate upon Clark’s attribution of correspondence theory of truth in the remainder of this chapter. There are various reasons for my focusing on Clark’s attribution; first, our present context is the correspondence theory of truth; second, she proposes arguments against other competing theories, i.e., pragmatic and coherence theories; third, Clark’s study is referred to as an example of good scholarly work on Nietzsche. Now, let us see the details of Clark’s construction of Nietzsche as a correspondence theorist.

4.2.2 Clark and Convention T: Correspondence, Pragmatic, and Coherence Theories of Truth

Before going into details of Maudemarie Clark’s argumentation that she used in her attribution of correspondence theory of truth to Nietzsche, I would like to emphasize that there is no reference to any of Nietzsche’s published or unpublished works in his argumentation. Her argumentation proceeds completely through the discussions of analytic philosophers concerning truth theories, not through Nietzsche’s views concerning truth. This tendency is, in my opinion, an example of above presented observation of Babich regarding the approaches of analytic scholars to Nietzsche’s philosophy.

⁴¹⁹ Walter Kaufmann, *Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Buber: Discovering the Mind*, Vol. 2, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1991, p. 165. See also, my discussion of Leiter’s “Memorandum” in Chapter 2.4.

⁴²⁰ See, Clark, Chapter 2, pp. 29-61; Richardson, pp. 223-257; Robert Nola, “Nietzsche’s Theory of Truth and Belief,” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, vol. XLVII, No. 4, 1987, pp. 525-61; Danto, pp. 50-81.

Clark's strategy is basically presenting the correspondence theory of truth as the only theory that is suitable for securing our truths by the help of "Tarski's Convention T," and eliminating other theories by using her "principle of equivalence" derived from Convention T. However, such an analysis has nothing to do with Nietzsche's conception of truth. Nietzsche's truth is not a matter for linguistic or logical analysis; his truth comes directly from life, and it must be judged from the point of view of life. As Nietzsche says "[l]ife is no argument."⁴²¹ Hence, for my part, trying to understand and judge Nietzsche's notion of truth through the methods of analytic philosophical tradition, at least in the way that current Nietzsche scholars have used, results in either missing or misunderstanding Nietzsche's philosophy.

Maudemarie Clark, at the outset, divides correspondence theory of truth into two versions; one is the metaphysical version and the other one is the common sense version. Following Hilary Putnam, Clark names the metaphysical version of the correspondence theory as metaphysical realism. For Clark, metaphysical realism is "the doctrine that reality is something-in-itself, that its nature is determinately constituted independently of us"; on the other hand, there are common sense version of the correspondence theory. Clark calls this as minimal correspondence theory, is that "which combines the equivalence principle with common sense or ontological realism."⁴²² After this division, Clark asserts that Nietzsche rejects or denies the former, and accepts the latter one; that is, for her, Nietzsche's truth theory is the common sense version of correspondence theory.⁴²³ This division opens the way for her to proceed on purely analytical grounds.

Clark's attribution of correspondence theory to Nietzsche heavily depends upon her conviction that the equivalence principle derived from Tarski's

⁴²¹ GS, §121, p. 177.

⁴²² Clark, pp. 40-41.

⁴²³ This division could be seen as the application of the analytic tactic, which is defined by Babich as the elimination of those parts of the issue under consideration that exceed the limits of the analytical philosophy, and focusing on the remainder of it. (See, the quotation on p. 163.) That is, here, Clark eliminates the metaphysical implications beforehand to provide herself a sterile space to carry on her analytical operation on Nietzsche's perspectivism.

Convention T is our surest intuition about truth. Anil Gupta summarizes the convention as follows:

Criterion T lays down two conditions that a materially adequate definition of truth must meet. The second, and less important, condition is that the definition should imply that only sentences are true. Tarski imposes this condition because he takes truth to be a predicate of sentences. The first, and more important, condition is that the definition should imply all the ‘T-biconditionals’, that is, all sentences of the form

(T) ‘*p*’ is a true sentence (of English) iff.

Thus, Criterion T requires that a definition of truth (for English) should imply, for example, the famous T-biconditional,

‘Snow is white’ is a true sentence (of English) iff snow is white.⁴²⁴

There is also another requirement that Clark does not mention in her presentation of Tarski’s Convention T. That is, truth must be defined in a metalanguage; otherwise, if it is defined in an ordinary language, it leads directly to the ‘liar paradox.’⁴²⁵ Being aware of the danger of falling into the liar paradox, Clark defines her equivalence principle as follows:

The equivalence principle tells us that we can state the conditions under which any sentence is true in a particular language by simply removing the quotation marks from the sentence, or . . . by providing in the metalanguage an interpretation of the sentence from which we have removed the quotation marks.⁴²⁶

⁴²⁴ Anil Gupta, “Tarski’s definition of truth,” in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Version 1.0, London and New York: Routledge, 1998. For a critique of Tarski’s ‘Convention T,’ see John Etchemendy, *The Concept of Logical Consequence*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990, ch. 8 (pp. 260-90).

⁴²⁵ (This Paradox is said to be first formulated by Eubulides of Miletus, who lived around BC. 4th Century.) Consider the following sentence ‘(S): Sentence (S) is not true.’ Then, applying the ‘Convention T,’ we get the following: ‘Sentence (S) is a true sentence iff sentence (S) is not true.’ Here, we have a paradox: sentence (S) says that sentence (S) is not true, yet if the sentence is not true then the sentence (S) true by the ‘Convention T,’ which means that the sentence (S) is false.

⁴²⁶ Clark, p. 32.

The application of this equivalence principle, thus, lead us to accept that the sentence “snow is white” is true in English iff snow is white, and the sentence “the Sun is located at the center of our galaxy” is true iff the Sun is located at the center of our galaxy. According to Clark, such equivalences, in accordance with the equivalence principle, are *trivially* true for everyone who has the knowledge of that language in which the sentence is uttered. Additionally, she claims that it is impossible for anyone who denies the truth of the sentences complying with the equivalence principle to share our concept of truth. Clark’s strong faithfulness to the equivalence principle leads her to conclude that it is the equivalence principle that governs the ordinary use of “true.” This means that discarding this “evident” fact about the concept of truth we cannot make any consistent claim about something; “Nietzsche cannot make any claims at all unless he would admit to considering them true in our ordinary sense,”⁴²⁷ that is, in accordance with the equivalence principle.

However, as Nietzsche argues in TL, such a claim is nothing but to say that the criterion of truth is constructed, or established by the society, and any statement or belief could be true if it is compatible, or stated according to, this established truth criterion. According to Nietzsche, the need for preserving his existence against the threat of other individuals, and the need for living socially, leads an individual to dissimulation for creating a peace treaty, namely language. Through this treaty, the criterion of truth is established; that is, truth is defined in accordance with the compatibility to this peace treaty.

[H]e needs to make peace and strives accordingly to banish from his world at least the most flagrant *bellum omni contra omnes* [war of each against all]. This peace treaty brings in its wake something which appears to be the first step toward acquiring that puzzling truth drive: to wit, *that* which shall count as “truth” from now on is established. That is to say, a uniformly valid and binding designation is invented for things, and this legislation of language likewise establishes the first laws of truth. For the contrast between truth and lie arises here for the first time. The liar is a person who uses the valid

⁴²⁷ Clark, p. 33.

designations, the words, in order to make something which is unreal appear to be real.⁴²⁸

Therefore, Clark's application of Convention T and her equivalence principle, as the above quotation suggests, rests upon the language as a peace treaty. Hence, by applying these two, Clark could only secure the use of the words and concepts according to established rules of language, and not according to their correspondence to the reality. That is, Clark demands that Nietzsche must use the language in accordance with the accepted rules, otherwise what he says could not be counted as true. This means that Clark compels Nietzsche to express his thoughts according to the old and established rules, whose roots lie in assumptions that are continuously refuted by him. Actually, Nietzsche necessarily used this language, yet he broke its rules to express his ideas which could not be expressible otherwise. As Grimm rightly notes, what "Nietzsche seeks to express through language is something which that language is ultimately incapable of expressing," yet he "has only inappropriate linguistic resources available to him, and this means that he is forced to formulate his ideas within an inauthentic framework."⁴²⁹ Essentially, most of Nietzsche's thoughts, which are perceived by us as contradictory and nonsense, seems so since we still expect from him to speak in the language that we are happily and trustfully using. We accept without questioning that "in language . . . [we] have possessed knowledge of the world,"⁴³⁰ yet, as Nietzsche says, "[e]very word is a prejudice."⁴³¹ Being aware of this fact, Nietzsche uses the language in an extraordinary way, he plays with the language to make it elastic enough to express his unconventional thoughts. Therefore, Clark's argumentation designated to portray Nietzsche as correspondence theorist, in my opinion, fails; even her approach leads her to misunderstand almost all of Nietzsche's philosophy.

⁴²⁸ TL, p. 81.

⁴²⁹ Grimm, p. 93.

⁴³⁰ HAH, vol. I, §11, p. 16.

⁴³¹ HAH, vol. II, part 2, "The Wanderer and His Shadow," §55, p. 323.

Clark uses this strategy not only for attributing the common sense version of correspondence theory to Nietzsche, but also for rejecting other competing truth theories for showing that there is no other suitable theory to attribute to him. Clark tries to eliminate pragmatic and coherence theories by using her argument based on the equivalence principle.

Clark tries to refute Danto's claim that Nietzsche has a pragmatic theory of truth. According to Danto, Nietzsche's criterion of truth shows us that he proposes a pragmatic theory of truth. Danto translates Nietzsche's criterion of truth, which states that "The criterion of truth resides in the enhancement of the feeling of power"⁴³² like the following: "*p* is true and *q* is false if *p* works and *q* does not."⁴³³ Although, at first sight, Danto's claim seems to be true, in my opinion, it has nothing to do with what Nietzsche wants to express with his criterion of truth. Danto, as most of the scholars (maybe, only the analytically oriented ones), misses, ignores, or misunderstands, Nietzsche's doctrine of will to power. For, Danto's claim would be valid, or true, only on the condition that if will to power is an attribute of a power center. However, as we have seen, will to power is what a power center, or entity is; it is not an external attribute or something attained later. Hence, for Nietzsche, power increase amounts to creation of truth through perspectival interpretation; interpretation is the process of actively shaping and assimilating the environment, or the world. If this shaping increases my power, then my interpretation is true; otherwise it is false. This interpretation process is not a duty imposed upon a power center from outside, and this process is endless. Let us remember that, for Nietzsche there is no distinction between the deed and the doer; this means that the power center is the very thing it does, i.e., interpretation, will to power, truth, etc. Furthermore, as we have already seen, power increase is more essential than self-preservation for a power center, it does not hesitate to risk its existence to increase the degree of power, which it is; for, it is simply just this lust for power. Without self-preservation, I think, we could not speak of pragmatism; that is, if a power center

⁴³² WP, §534, p. 290.

⁴³³ Danto, p. 54.

risks its existence for increasing its power, then the pragmatic or utilitarian consequences of a possible power increase could not be motivating factor behind its struggle for power. It is just this possible power increase that a power center seeks, not its consequences. Hence, to claim that Nietzsche has a pragmatic theory of truth, or that his criterion of truth is the pragmatic consequences of a belief, is nonsensical.

However, Clark's refutation of the pragmatic theory of truth proceeds not from Nietzsche's thoughts, but from her famous equivalence principle.⁴³⁴ In my opinion, this shows us that she is not concerned with Nietzsche's thoughts, and that what she is trying to do is to show that she has a contemporary version of Procrustes' bed to deal with the unconventional philosophers and their thoughts.

Clark, contented with the equivalence principle, makes a very strange claim that to say that Nietzsche uses pragmatic theory of truth when he speaks about truth, or he defines truth in terms of pragmatic consequences, "does not give us a new theory of truth, a new account of what we are doing when we picked out certain beliefs as true (or, of what the beliefs so picked out supposed to have in common)," on the contrary, it throws away the concept of truth (of course, determined by the equivalence principle); that is, it "proposes that we use 'true' or '*wahr*' in a different way than do speakers of standard English or German."⁴³⁵ Because of this, according to Clark, it is not possible to attribute a pragmatic theory of truth to Nietzsche, which amounts to claiming that he uses true or truth in a way other than the ordinary use; yet, for her, there is no reason for Nietzsche to reject our ordinary use of truth. Hence, it is impossible to attribute Nietzsche a truth theory other than correspondence without making him the victim of Clark's mortal claim that "unless Nietzsche has a reason to reject our ordinary use of 'true'," evidently, for her, he does not have, "his new use would seem to reflect only an arbitrary linguistic decision of no philosophical

⁴³⁴ See, note 161 on page 56, for Babich's critique of this tendency of analytic Nietzsche scholars.

⁴³⁵ Clark, p. 33.

interest.”⁴³⁶ Clark believes that if a theory of truth is to be attributed to Nietzsche it should be compatible with the equivalence principle; hence, the pragmatic theory of truth could not be attributed to Nietzsche because of its incompatibility with the principle. However, as I have tried to explain above, Clark misses Nietzsche’s point wholly, since Nietzsche has a very important reason to use the word truth in a way other than the ordinary use; that is, he has a very unconventional concept of truth in his mind, yet the only tool available for expressing it is the established language.

Clark turns to the other competing theory of truth: the coherence theory. This theory, Clark says, seems to be the most suitable candidate for being Nietzsche’s theory of truth; since the coherence theory of truth which sees truth in the relation among beliefs or representations, not between our beliefs and the world. However, for her, the coherence theory of truth has nothing to say about the relation between the sentences or beliefs and the world. Because of this, Clark argues that there arises the problem of justification of our beliefs. That is, the coherence among our beliefs does not guarantee or justify their truth in the correspondence sense, and this justification, for Clark, is a requisite for coherence theory to be legitimate theory of truth.

Clark starts to test if the correspondence between our beliefs and the world could provide such a justification for coherence theory. Accepting that in some cases we could justify our beliefs simply by looking the world, she denies correspondence as a general justification of our beliefs in the scope of coherence theory of truth. First of all, Clark argues, simply by observing we could not justify our beliefs, because observations also require other kinds of explanations. For example, the justification of our belief that “it is raining,” for Clark, cannot be justified by looking at the window. “We would, for instance, need a different explanation for our observation of falling water if we believed the sky was completely clear.”⁴³⁷ Hence, for her, we cannot gain access to reality unmediated by our other beliefs by applying sense experience in justifying our beliefs.

⁴³⁶ Clark, p. 33.

⁴³⁷ Clark, p. 34.

Quoting Quine, she concludes that “our statements about the external world face the tribunal of sense experience not individually but only as a corporate body,”⁴³⁸ and sense experience justifies a belief “indirectly through considerations of equilibrium [coherence] affecting the field [the system of beliefs] as a whole.”⁴³⁹ Clark follows this view arguing that there is no other way than to apply our beliefs in justifying our beliefs, by the help of Davidson’s claim that “nothing can count as a reason for holding a belief except another belief.”⁴⁴⁰ In other words, according to coherence theory, we judge a belief by its coherence with our other accepted beliefs.

Clark continues her discussion against the coherence theory by trying to show the responses of the coherence theorists when she wants to inject the correspondence theory inside the coherence theory. She claims that, for example, it is possible for a coherence theorist to accept the view for which coherence is the criterion of truth while correspondence is the nature of truth. For Clark, a coherence theorist may respond to such a claim by saying that the criterion of truth for coherence theory is consistency and coherence among our beliefs, and it does not guarantee the correspondence between our beliefs and the external world. Therefore, it is unnecessary to impose a correspondence criterion on the coherence theory of truth. One of the coherent theorists, who gives such a response, is Brand Blanshard; he says that the fact that our beliefs cohere does nothing to “prove that anything precisely corresponding to them exists ‘out there.’”⁴⁴¹

Against this conclusive response of the coherence theorists, Clark considers Nicholas Rescher’s claim that the coherence theorists must accept “certainly not the premise of the correspondence theory that truth *means* correspondence to fact, but merely its consequence, that truths must correspond

⁴³⁸ W. V. O. Quine, *From a Logical Point of View*, New York: Harper & Row, 1961, p. 41. Quoted by M. Clark, p. 34.

⁴³⁹ Quine, p. 43. Quoted by M. Clark, p. 34-5. (Brackets are added by Clark).

⁴⁴⁰ Donald Davidson, “A Coherence Theory of Truth and Knowledge,” in *Kant oder Hegel*, ed. Dieter Heinrich, Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1984, p. 426.

⁴⁴¹ Brand Blanshard, *Nature of Thought*, Vol. 2, London: Allen & Unwin, 1939, p. 268. Quoted by Clark, p. 35.

to the facts.”⁴⁴² Clark maintains, in response to this claim, that coherence theorists may deny that there is a distinct realm in which there are facts, distinct entities, supposed to correspond to the beliefs. That is, they may deny the existence of a distinct fact of snowing which is supposed to correspond to the sentence “it is snowing,” even if they accept the equivalence principle.

Facing such a problem, Clark tries to save the correspondence theory with the help of John L. Austin’s arguments for the defense of the correspondence theory of truth. Austin argues that it is almost impossible to deny the assertion that a statement is true if it corresponds to the facts. Yet, for him, it may be misleading in two different ways according to our understanding of the term “fact.” First way, we may take fact as being an alternative way of expressing “true statement.” If we follow this way, we are lead to the coherence theory of truth, which for Austin, failed “to appreciate the trite but the central point that truth is a matter of the relationship between words and world.”⁴⁴³ For Austin, a fact is a state of affairs in the world, and as such it is completely different from the true statements about it. By a statement we describe a state of affairs which makes that statement true. This means that statements become true when the state of affairs is the one which they describe: “I can only describe the situation in which it is true to say that I am feeling sick by saying that it is one in which I am feeling sick (or experiencing sensations of nausea): yet between stating, however truly, that I am feeling sick and feeling sick there is a great gulf fixed.”⁴⁴⁴ On the other hand, in the second way, we accept that for every true statement there is only one peculiar corresponding fact; that is, there is one to one correspondence between true statements and facts. If we follow this second way, we get a highly overpopulated world with linguistic duplicates. That is, then there should be corresponding true statements for every single fact, whether it is positive or negative or highly specific or highly general. In Austin’s words,

⁴⁴² Nicholas Rescher, *The Coherence Theory of Truth*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973, p. 28. Quoted by Clark, p. 35.

⁴⁴³ John L. Austin, *Philosophical Papers*, 2d ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970, p. 123. Quoted by Clark, p. 36.

⁴⁴⁴ Austin, p. 123-24.

“we populate the world with the linguistic *Doppelgänger* (and grossly overpopulate it—every nugget of ‘positive’ fact overlaid by a massive concentration of ‘negative’ facts, every tiny detailed fact larded with generous general facts, and so on).”⁴⁴⁵

However, as Clark pointed out, there arises another problem. The problem is formulated by Davidson. He claims that if a statement corresponds to any fact, then it corresponds to every fact. This claim is known as the Great Fact argument, and goes as follows; a true statement cannot be said to be corresponding to something very different by the replacement of co-referring singular terms, or by the replacement of logically equivalent sentences, therefore, if any true statements correspond to any fact, then they all corresponds to the same thing, to the Great Fact. Clark illustrates this argument in the following way:

[C]onsider the statement that New York is east of Chicago. This obviously corresponds to the fact that New York is east of Chicago. But it also seems to correspond to the fact that Chicago is west of New York, and therefore to the fact that Chicago is west of Detroit and Detroit is west of New York as well as the fact that Chicago is west of the largest city in the United States. . . .they all correspond to the same facts, to the “Great Fact.”⁴⁴⁶

Clark, to avoid both the linguistic *Doppelgänger* and the Great Fact, claims that the statements about facts do not select distinct entities to which truths could correspond, yet they constitute another way of talking about truths. That is, when we talk about facts, we are talking not about an entity in the world, but about what is true about the world. For Clark, this does not prevent us from claiming that true beliefs are those corresponding to the world or reality. Because, for her, “there are entities ontologically distinct from true beliefs,” and

⁴⁴⁵ Austin, p. 123. *Doppelgänger* or double-ganger: “The apparition of a living person; a double, a wraith.” “Double-ganger,” in *Oxford English Dictionary* (online version), (accessed January 11, 2007), <http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50068997>.

⁴⁴⁶ Clark, p. 36.

“what these distinct entities are like (what is true of them, what predicates they satisfy) determines whether or not our beliefs are true.”⁴⁴⁷

As the final step, for her construction of Nietzsche as a correspondence theorist, Clark tries to cut the last branch to which coherence theory clings; namely subjective idealism. She takes Berkeley’s idealism, which says that to be is to perceive or to be perceived as typical subjective idealism. For her, the contemporary version of this idealism lies in Derrida’s claim that “there is nothing outside the text,”⁴⁴⁸ which means, for Clark, there is only representation. According to Clark, subjective idealism supports the coherence theory of truth in that if there is only representation or text and nothing beyond, then there is nothing for them to correspond. Yet, for her, such a subjectivism could be rejected on the ground of common sense realism which claims basically that there is an external world out there independently of us, and it is knowable. On this ground, Clark claims that common sense realism is actually the equivalence principle. That is, if the world exists independently and our beliefs are about it, then our beliefs can be true only if they correspond to it. In such a world, then, “it is raining” corresponds to the world iff it is raining. As a result of her whole argumentation, Clark concludes that unless Nietzsche commits himself to subjective realism there is no reason for him to reject correspondence theory of truth on the side of coherence theory. However, as she notes, it is evident from Nietzsche’s writings that he rejects every kind of idealism.⁴⁴⁹ Therefore, Clark concludes that “if he is consistent, then, Nietzsche must accept a correspondence conception of truth.”⁴⁵⁰

⁴⁴⁷ Clark, p. 38.

⁴⁴⁸ Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, Baltimore, Maryland; The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998, p. 158.

⁴⁴⁹ For example: “To study physiology with a clear conscience, one must insist that the sense organs are *not* phenomena in the sense of idealistic philosophy; as such they could not be causes! Sensualism, therefore, at least as a regulative hypothesis, if not as a heuristic principle. What? And others even say that the external world is the work of our organs? But then our body, as a part of this external world, would be the work of our organs! But then our organs themselves would be—the work of our organs! It seems to me that this is a complete *reductio ad absurdum*, assuming that the concept of a *causa sui* is something fundamentally absurd. Consequently, the external world is *not* the work of our organs—?” (BGE, 15)

⁴⁵⁰ Clark, p. 40.

Here, again, as in the case of her refutation of the pragmatic theory of truth, Clark does not refer to Nietzsche's texts. Her discussion gives us no idea about Nietzsche's attitude toward the coherence theory. Clark's arguments against pragmatic and coherence theories might be good examples of analytical reasoning; they may show us her success in using analytical methods, but they have nothing to do with her attribution of correspondence theory to Nietzsche. Let us try to find out what would be Nietzsche's response to coherence theory. First of all, judging a belief through established system of beliefs is unacceptable for Nietzsche on the ground that the idea of an established system of beliefs presupposes both that there is a static and stable set of beliefs and that there is a stable and unchanging world. In other words, requiring that a belief must cohere with other previously acquired beliefs for counting it as true means that there is a stable set of beliefs that were accepted to be true and if the newly acquired belief is consistent with the members of this set it becomes a truth, or a true belief. Further, such a set of beliefs implies the existence of the belief concerning the stability of the world or reality out there apart from the question of correspondence. That is, since our beliefs are of this world in which we live and since we construct a stable set of beliefs out of them, this set necessarily includes a belief in the stability of the world, it does not matter whether this belief corresponds to the world or not; otherwise, we cannot speak of judging a belief by applying our previously gained beliefs. These two implications of coherence theory, as we know, are rejected and criticized by Nietzsche. Belief in the existence of a stable world and the belief in the truth of our beliefs concerning this world are, actually, what Nietzsche rejects by his perspectivism. Moreover, coherence theory evokes philosophical systems, to which Nietzsche evidently opposes. The set of beliefs used by coherence theorist is actually a system; that is to say, those beliefs belonging to that set of beliefs are so systematically connected with each other that one belief is validated by, and validates every other belief. Therefore, there appears a systematically connected unity, into which no belief that does not meet the requirements of this system could not enter. Furthermore, when we consider Nietzsche's criterion of truth and his

doctrine of the will to power, it becomes evident that any belief that is validated through our set of beliefs might decrease our power and becomes false whereas another belief that is invalidated, or not confirmed, might increase our power and becomes true. Consequently, coherence theory could not be attributable to Nietzsche, who says “I mistrust all systematizers and I avoid them. The will to a system is a lack of integrity.”⁴⁵¹

As I have noted, at the beginning of this section, Clark does not refer to Nietzsche’s works. She does not even discuss possible responses of Nietzsche to correspondence, pragmatic or coherence theories. She only argues for her conviction that the correspondence theory is the only possible truth theory. Since it is the only possible theory, therefore, Nietzsche’s truth theory must be the correspondence theory. However, such an argumentation has nothing to do with Nietzsche’s notion of truth. Clark, instead of referring to Nietzsche’s views, i.e., will to power and perspectivism, builds her argument purely on linguistic and conceptual analysis. However, as we briefly mentioned earlier in our discussion, for Nietzsche, language is a peace treaty among the members of a society; hence it is our product, and thus, it is a bit of naïveté to expect from language to give us truth. Let us conclude this chapter by concentrating on Nietzsche’s discussion of the relation between language and truth that he presented in his TL.

4.2.3 Truth and Language in a Non-analytic Sense

TL is one of the most interesting and the most important texts of Nietzsche. Yet, deliberately, he did not publish this text in his life time; he even seems to have tried to keep it secret.⁴⁵² But it is not clear why he chose not to publish the text. What makes this text interesting and important is that Nietzsche’s metaphoric

⁴⁵¹ TL, “Maxims and Arrows,” §26, p. 470.

⁴⁵² The text is written in 1873, and Nietzsche mentioned the text only once in the 1886 preface of second volume of *Human, All too Human*. There he writes “I produced an essay I have refrained from publishing, ‘On Truth and Falsehood in an Extra-Moral Sense.’” (HAH, vol. II, preface §1, p. 209.) According to Geoff Waite, this single occurrence of the name of the text has the aim of alerting “a few readers to the existence of a text about which he would say nothing more to others.” (Geoff Waite, *Nietzsche’s Corps/E: Aesthetics, Politics, Prophecy, Or, the Spectacular Technoculture of Everyday Life*, Durham: Duke University Press, 1996, p. 255.)

use of language is at its height, and his insights both into the relation between truth and language and into the genesis of the will to truth are very remarkable.

Nietzsche starts with an allegoric story, in which he describe the vanity of man being proud of his intellect and power of knowing. For him, the human intellect looks miserable, shadowy, transient, aimless and arbitrary within nature. Since “[t]here were eternities during which it did not exist. And when it is all over with the human intellect, nothing will have happened. For this intellect has no additional mission which would lead it beyond human life.”⁴⁵³ However, we feel that the intellect and the power of knowing elevate us above all the creatures in the universe. Yet, they are so important only for their possessors, for us. As Nietzsche notes, “[t]here is nothing so reprehensible and unimportant in nature that it would not immediately swell up like a balloon at the slightest puff of this power of knowing.”⁴⁵⁴ We boast about our power of knowing as if it makes us the most valuable creature in the universe. However, this pride concerning our intellect and power of knowing is the product of our intellect, and prevents us from seeing the fact that the intellect is a tool for survival. Hence, the intellect preserves us by deceiving us about the value of our existence. That is, the intellect, preventing us from seeing that it is given to us only for our survival not for knowing, survives us; it deceives us about itself. Nietzsche explains this deceptive character of the intellect as the following:

It is remarkable that this was brought about by the intellect, which was certainly allotted to these most unfortunate, delicate, and ephemeral beings merely as a device for detaining them a minute within existence. For without this addition they would have every reason to flee this existence as quickly as Lessing’s son. The pride connected with knowing and sensing lies like a blinding fog over the eyes and senses of men, thus deceiving them concerning the value of existence. For this pride contains within itself the most flattering estimation of the value of knowing. Deception is the most general effect of such pride,

⁴⁵³ TL, p. 79.

⁴⁵⁴ TL, p. 79.

but even its most particular effects contain within themselves something of the same deceitful character.⁴⁵⁵

Moreover, the intellect preserves weak individuals by unfolding its power in dissimulation. Since, the weak have no power for waging war for existence. For Nietzsche, this dissimulation reaches its peak in man, which is the weakest creature of nature. Dissimulation becomes almost the only rule among man so that “there is almost nothing which is less comprehensible than how an honest and pure drive for truth could have arisen among them.”⁴⁵⁶ If our condition of existence is dissimulation, and if our intellect deceives us about its nature, and if it is also a tool for dissimulation, then, how did we get this drive for truth in us?

For Nietzsche, this drive for truth comes from language, or it is rooted in our language. As we have already seen,⁴⁵⁷ for Nietzsche, language is a peace treaty among the individuals who want to live as a society from boredom and necessity. That is, individuals, who want to live together, make a peace treaty among each other. The very first thing that they do after making the treaty is to construct a common language that makes communication possible among them; hence, truth is determined. “That is to say, a uniformly valid and binding designation is invented for things, and this legislation of language likewise establishes the first laws of truth.”⁴⁵⁸ Thus, the line between truth and lie is drawn; the person who uses language, or designations properly is truthful, and the person, who uses language improperly is a liar. Lying is, therefore, breaking the rules of the society, which threatens the peace prevailing in that society. Because of this potential peace breaking character of lying, liars, who lie in a selfish and harmful manner are excluded from the society. Nietzsche argues that what is shunned by excluding liars from the society is the harmful consequences of lying rather than fraud. According to Nietzsche, a similar tendency is operative in man’s wanting truth; that is, when man wants truth it is not the pure

⁴⁵⁵ TL, pp. 79-80. Lessing’s son was born at Christmas, but by the 10th of January both the child and his wife were dead.

⁴⁵⁶ TL, p. 80.

⁴⁵⁷ See, 4.2.2 above.

⁴⁵⁸ TL, p. 81.

knowledge, or the truth-in-itself, but useful consequences of truth which facilitate his preservation. As Nietzsche puts it, one “desires the pleasant and life-preserving consequences of truth. He is indifferent toward pure knowledge which has no consequences; towards those truths which are possibly harmful and destructive he is even hostilely inclined.”⁴⁵⁹ Hence, for Nietzsche, the origin of the drive for truth lies in that peace treaty established through the language, and this drive is directed not to truth-in-itself, but to those life-preserving and pleasant truths. Furthermore, our truths are nothing more than the descriptions of the facts by using the proper designations in the language. This means that our truth already presupposes coherence as the criterion of truth; that is, if we use language properly, or in accordance with its established rules, all our propositions, sentences, or statements will necessarily cohere with each other.

Nietzsche further investigates the formation process of the designations of language, i.e., words and concepts, to show that there is no relation between these designations and the entities which we suppose to exist. In other words, these designations do not correctly and firmly represent the entities. Otherwise, the root of the language would be truth, not the peace treaty among the members of the society. In which case, we could not speak of any qualities of any entity or thing, since qualities are given to us through our sensations, which are subjective, or peculiar to every individual. In Nietzsche’s words, “[i]f truth alone had been the deciding factor in the genesis of language, and if the standpoint of certainty had been decisive for designations, then how could we still dare to say ‘the stone is hard,’ as if ‘hard’ were something otherwise familiar to us, and not merely a totally subjective stimulation!”⁴⁶⁰ Other than the subjective character of qualitative words, Nietzsche refers to the multiplicity of languages spoken all over the world as another example that shows us that it is not truth, which lies at the genesis of language and it is not the standpoint of certainty which is decisive for the linguistic designations. He argues that if truth and certainty had had such roles in the formation of language and its designations, then there would be only

⁴⁵⁹ TL, p. 81.

⁴⁶⁰ TL, pp. 81-82.

one language. That is, “[t]he various languages placed side by side show that with words it is never a question of truth, never a question of adequate expression; otherwise, there would not be so many languages.”⁴⁶¹ What is expressed through language is, for Nietzsche, our relations with things through metaphors. That is, our words are just metaphors and they only express the relation between us and things, not the things in their actual existence. In the formation of words, according to Nietzsche, there appear two metaphors; in the first metaphor, a nerve stimulus is converted into an image, and, in the second, this image is imitated with a sound; a word is the metaphor of a metaphor. Nietzsche draws an analogy: a deaf man, after seeing Chladni’s sound figures⁴⁶² and realizing that these figures are caused by the vibrations of the string, claims that he knows what a sound is, or what is meant by the word sound. “It is this way with all of us concerning language: we believe that we know something about the things themselves when we speak of trees, colors, snow, and flowers; and yet we possess nothing but metaphors for things—metaphors which correspond in no way to the original entities.”⁴⁶³ Moreover, a word, or metaphor, becomes a concept when it is applied cases similar to the one in which it is created. However, for Nietzsche, applying a word to other similar cases is nothing but equalization of unequal things. For example, when I apply the word leaf to refer to all of the similar things, it becomes a concept; yet it is impossible to find two leaves that are identical. According to Nietzsche, this implies the existence of an independently existing leaf apart from the leaves that exist in nature. That is, this implies that there exists a leaf form according to which every other leaf is shaped. Since there is no such thing as the leaf form in the world, or nature, Nietzsche names the concept of leaf as *qualitas occulta*.⁴⁶⁴ Thus, our

⁴⁶¹ TL, p. 82.

⁴⁶² Ernst Florens Chladni (1756-1827), German physicist, one of the founders of modern scientific acoustics. His “sound figures” (sometimes called “Chladni figures” or “sand figures”) are patterns made on a sand-covered flat surface by the sonic vibrations produced by a string affixed below the plane. (See, Breazeale’s footnote 55, in Friedrich Nietzsche, *Philosophy and Truth: Selections from Nietzsche’s Notebooks of the Early 1870’s*, p. 24-25.)

⁴⁶³ TL, pp. 82-83.

⁴⁶⁴ Occult quality.

concepts are nothing but occult qualities created by us through eliminating individual differences among entities. Nietzsche says the following:

We know nothing about an essential quality called “honesty”; but we do know of countless individualized and consequently unequal actions which we equate by omitting the aspects in which they are unequal and which we now designate as “honest actions.” Finally, we formulate from them a *qualitas occulta* which has the name “honesty.”⁴⁶⁵

Thus, our concepts in no way correspond to the external world; they are only tools created by us, for dealing with the chaotic world of becoming; for classifying, categorizing, etc. Then, if our language is nothing but a peace treaty, our words are metaphors, and our concepts are occult qualities, what is truth? Here is Nietzsche’s answer:

What then is truth? A movable host of metaphors, metonymies, and anthropomorphisms: in short, a sum of human relations which have been poetically and rhetorically intensified, transferred, and embellished, and, which, after long usage, seem to a people to be fixed, canonical, and binding. Truths are illusions which we have forgotten are illusions: they are metaphors that have become worn out and have been drained of sensuous force, coins which have lost their embossing and are now considered as metal and no longer as coins.⁴⁶⁶

Hence, linguistic analysis could give us nothing concerning truth, but only whether the given sentence or proposition is constructed out of the usual metaphors in accordance with fixed rules of the language; in other words, it determines whether the given statement is a truth or a lie. Actually, as far as our traditional notion of truth and of language are concerned, what is counted as true is also a lie but said according to the rules. That is, statements could never correspond to entities or facts in the outer world; hence they could not express truth in the correspondence sense; but we behave as if our statements correspond to the world and are capable of expressing the truth of this correspondence. However, as Nietzsche indicates, we accept these lies as truths belonging to

⁴⁶⁵ TL, p. 83.

⁴⁶⁶ TL, p. 83.

nature or reality, since we forgot their genesis; we forgot that language, its designations. This forgetting results in our complete dependence on truth and language; on the belief that there is truth independent of us, we have the ability to find out and grasp it, and our language is capable of expressing it in an adequate way. Yet, for Nietzsche, all of this cognitive story and its characters are our products. Nietzsche, comparing our cognitive construction of the world with the bee's construction of beehive, observes that "whereas the bee builds with wax that he gathers from nature, man builds with the far more delicate conceptual material which he first has to manufacture from himself."⁴⁶⁷ Hence, our truths are anthropomorphic in the sense that what we search is already created and placed into the world by us. That is, to use Nietzsche's example, we define what a mammal is, and when we see an animal, let us say a camel, say that camel is a mammal. For Nietzsche, this is a truth but in a limited and anthropomorphic sense, since it is not a truth independent of us; "it is a thoroughly anthropomorphic truth which contains not a single point which would be 'true in itself' or really and universally valid apart from man."⁴⁶⁸ In nature, there are no such divisions among entities and creatures according to their qualities, forms, etc.; it is we who impose these divisions over nature. However, according to Nietzsche, the entities we name and divide are given not as something in themselves, but as metaphors created by us, yet, forgetting this fact, we take them as existing independently of us. Hence, when we define what a mammal is, and seeing a camel, say that it is a mammal, this does not mean that such a division or a species really exists in the world; it is a truth, but only for us, not for other creatures or entities; since language and its rules, concepts, definitions, and divisions are all created by us as metaphors, and they could in no way correspond, or adequately express, the external world.

Consequently, analyzing Nietzsche's thoughts concerning truth as if it is a matter of language is, firstly, not a fair way of investigation as far as the above presented genealogy of our language and of our will to truth is concerned;

⁴⁶⁷ TL, p. 85.

⁴⁶⁸ TL, p. 85.

secondly, anyone who tries to understand Nietzsche's philosophy through such analysis would miss all the original and important aspects of it; even some of them misses the very crucial point that Nietzsche is a philosopher.⁴⁶⁹ If we remember Clark's argumentation, it was heavily dependent upon the discussion concerning the truth theories and proceeds through linguistic and logical analysis. However, Nietzsche's above presented view concerning the genesis and nature of our language and truth makes such argumentation inapplicable to Nietzsche's notion of truth. Since her beloved Convention T and the principle of equivalence are the products of the Western culture; they are controlling mechanisms concerning the use of language. All words and concepts, although they were formerly vivid and living metaphors, have been imposed fixed meanings and their use have been determined by rules. What Clark does by applying equivalence principle is nothing but to test whether Nietzsche's use of concepts breaks those rules. However, the result of this test, affirmative or negative, could not give us anything concerning truth in the sense of any of the traditional truth theories; since the character of language is metaphorical and it stems from the need for a peace treaty among the individuals for their preservation.

Furthermore, for the same reasons, it also becomes impossible to attribute a truth theory to Nietzsche's perspectivism; since, as in the case of the judgment that camel is a mammal, we define truth and the criterion of truth. Nietzsche's perspectivism does not presuppose any truth theory that falls under any one of our major truth theories; neither correspondence, nor coherence, nor pragmatic. His conception of the world as will to power, as becoming, as chaos, as continuous power struggle, completely conflicts with our conception of the world as changeless and stable world of being, on which our conception of truth depends. His perspectivism is complete denial of our epistemology based on the knowing subject and the passive object; through perspectivism he destroys our cognitive paradigm and its subsequent assumptions and tools; such as, causality, logic, subject object distinction, etc. In short, through the doctrine of will to

⁴⁶⁹ For example, title of Danto's book is *Nietzsche as Philosopher*.

power and perspectivism, Nietzsche wanted to show that our pride concerning our truths and knowledge about the world and their value is in vain; since all are our products and they have nothing to do with actual existence of the world; we have created a world through lies or illusions, and are living in it; yet, this does not prove that this world corresponds to the actual world. However, as this world construction helps us in surviving, it becomes a truth for us; we accept it as expressing the world as it *is*. For Nietzsche, this construction of the world is only an interpretation of the actual world among the infinite possible interpretations. Hence, sticking to this interpretation is nothing but to diminish the possibilities for a richer and fuller life. Because of this, Nietzsche attacked all our absolute truths and cognitive mechanisms and assumptions that lead to absolute truths. Disregarding this aspect of Nietzsche's philosophy is another common error among the scholars who attribute a truth theory to him. What Nietzsche wants is to eliminate absolute truths while truth theories prescribe how to produce absolute truths.

Nietzsche is opposed to correspondence theory of truth because of its implication of a stable and unchanging world, which brings about distinctions between subject-object and apparent-real world; because of its presupposition that the subject could have a direct access to the world, without any interference coming from his perceptual mechanisms or other sources; and because of its dependence on the language's ability to express the world as it is. However, one may still insist that Nietzsche's account of language in TL, presupposes correspondence theory of truth. Such a claim, in my opinion, could be made by someone who did not understand what Nietzsche is trying to explain there. That is, Nietzsche's aim was not to present his thoughts concerning the ideal language in his mind, rather his aim was to debunk language as a means to truth. He tried to show that the genesis of our language was a peace treaty among the members of the society and that it was highly metaphorical. Our language, as a peace treaty, at its beginning, did not aim at correctly expressing the world, but at constructing an order among the members of the society to maintain their survival. Words and concepts were designated and the rules for their use were

fixed to make this peace treaty possible. The peace treaty is constructed through the creation of these designations and the determination of the conditions of their use. Yet, the origin of these designations were metaphors, or the metaphorical translation of a sense stimulus into an image (first metaphor), and then imitation of this image through a sound (second metaphor). This genealogical analysis of language shows us that our language has nothing to do with the external reality; at most, it could give us a metaphorical representation of the world, which is created by us again as a metaphor. Here, a correspondence might appear in the sense that our metaphors corresponds to the world created by us, as in the case of mammal and camel. We can define something and find entities in the world that would correspond to that definition; hence, as Nietzsche rightly notes, this does not give us a truth about the world in its actual existence.

Furthermore, it maybe claimed that Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power and criterion of truth obviously imply pragmatic theory of truth. However, such a claim means that Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power is, or assumes, a teleological principle. As we have already seen in our discussion of the relation between the doctrine of the will to power and Darwinism, will to power is not a teleological principle; a claim of teleology means that striving for power is something external to the power quantum; that the power center and the striving for power are distinct entities, that the striving for power is an attribute of the power center. As we know, Nietzsche evidently rejects the separation of the doer from the deed; that is, for him, a thing, an entity, or a power center is just what it does. Since, for him, everything is will to power and as will to power everything strives for power; thus everything is striving for power. There is no such a thing as striving for power as a separate entity, or as an attributable quality. There appears another problem in attributing a pragmatic theory of truth to Nietzsche. For him, a power center is nothing but striving for power, in its struggle for power it risks its preservation and existence. Pragmatically it must not be acceptable to pursue something at the expense of self-preservation. In other words, will to power exceeds the limits of pragmatism.

As for the coherence theory of truth, since it assumes a static world and a system of beliefs, it could not be Nietzsche's theory of truth. Coherence theory may be related to the concept of language as presented by Nietzsche in TL. That is, coherence is similar to the requirements of a treaty for determining what should count as true. If a statement or a belief coheres with our established beliefs then it is true, otherwise it is false. However, an established system of beliefs implies the existence of a static and unchanging world, whether it corresponds to the actual world or not. The system remains unchanging as a reference in judging newly acquired beliefs, otherwise it could not use it as a reference. Nietzsche is opposed to all systems; since, for him, clinging to a system closes the door to those beliefs which, although conflicting with our system of beliefs, could increase our feeling of power. Thus, coherence theory cannot be Nietzsche's truth theory.

If neither correspondence, nor pragmatic, nor coherence theories of truth can be attributed to Nietzsche, then, what is his truth theory? Or is it necessary to attribute a truth theory to him? I believe that Nietzsche does not assume a truth theory in his perspectivism. What he tried to do with perspectivism is to heal our obsession with truth and its value. Through his perspectivism, Nietzsche shows us that our truths have nothing to do with our conception of truth as absolute and eternal; they are simply interpretations, and thus, illusions in the sense that they correspond to nothing, and that they could not give us the reality as it is in itself. None of the presuppositions concerning causality, ego, consciousness, laws of nature, etc., on which our knowledge and truth depends exist, we simply create them to preserve our existence in the chaotic world of becoming. Although these presuppositions might have contributed to furthering our power, when they become absolute truths, for Nietzsche, they start to prevent further increase of our power. Hence, blaming us for our weakness and cowardice, he tries to show us that for the sake of our preservation we are living a life, which is poor, insipid and worthless. Of course, in his attempt to show all of these life negating effects of our absolute truths, he deals with the concept of truth, yet, as Ken Gemes

rightly observes,⁴⁷⁰ his aim is not to provide us with another set of absolute truths or with another truth theory.

⁴⁷⁰ “Nietzsche is ultimately not interested in (theories of) truth. This is not to say that Nietzsche is not acutely concerned with the role that the concept and rhetoric of truth had played within various cultures. By the same token an interest in the role the concept of witches played in 17th century English culture need not betoken any interest or belief in witches.” (Ken Gemes, “Nietzsche’s Critique of Truth,” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, vol. 52, No. 1, (March, 1992), p. 48.)

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

What I have tried to do is to show that those controversies among certain scholars concerning Nietzsche's views on the issues of truth, knowledge, and epistemology stem from their awkward approach to what Nietzsche is saying. By awkward I mean that they try to make Nietzsche's philosophy understandable, bearable, and even safer for the survival of the society, within their sterile and clear domain of knowledge by pruning the branches, knots and barks that could violate the purity, the esteem, and the beauty of that domain. Hence, what they get as Nietzsche, or as his philosophy, becomes something like a puppet at the hands of a ventriloquist, who makes the puppet say whatever the master wants. Their ignoring of the importance of some of the main concepts, i.e., will to power and perspectivism in Nietzsche's philosophy and the nuances in his use of concepts and words, i.e., truth and knowledge, leads them to draw controversial and conflicting Nietzsche portraits. Furthermore, trying to place Nietzsche into our established edifice of knowledge with our traditional cognitive and conceptual tools is not a faithful way of approaching him and his philosophy, since what he tries to do is just to destroy, or deconstruct this edifice and the tools that are used in its construction. In short, contemporary Nietzsche studies tend to become more analytical under the influence of global domination of universities and philosophy departments by analytical thought with its pragmatic successes, especially in the domain of natural sciences. However, trying to understand Nietzsche's thoughts with the methods of analytical philosophy give us nothing about the greatness and the meaning of his thoughts. Nietzsche already rejects and refutes the methods and the tools of the analytic philosophy; as we have seen, he rejects logic and language as tools for truth. Throughout my dissertation I have tried to show how such tendencies and approaches have

resulted in a misunderstanding of Nietzsche's thought by explicating those concepts which are ignored or whose content is emptied by the scholars.

The most important of these concepts is the doctrine of will to power; I believe that almost all of his philosophy is based on this concept. His perspectivism is wholly based on the concept of will to power. Therefore, first, I have dealt with this concept, and tried to explain it in full detail. Since there are not abundant references to this concept in Nietzsche's published books, I relied heavily on his unpublished texts, in which the concept of the will to power is a prevalent topic. Although there is an ongoing discussion concerning the legitimacy of these texts among Nietzsche scholars, I took them as legitimate as published ones; for, the topic of this dissertation makes this necessary. In order to achieve a better understanding of the concept, after giving a detailed explanation of the concept as presented by Nietzsche in both his published and unpublished texts, I have concentrated upon major claims concerning the nature of the concept by prominent Nietzsche scholars. In this context, I have dealt firstly with the general tendency of seeing the concept as a Darwinian principle, and comparing the fundamental characteristic of Nietzsche's concept of the will to power and Darwin's theory of evolution I have shown that the concept is in no way a Darwinian principle. Secondly, I have elaborated the claims that Nietzsche is a metaphysician by Heidegger and Richardson. Again, by appealing to Nietzsche's concept of will to power and his construction of the world out of will to power, I have tried to show that there are some deficiencies in both commentators' reception of the concept and Nietzsche's philosophy that lead them to make such a claim; hence, I have argued that neither Heidegger's nor Richardson's claims are strong enough to make Nietzsche a metaphysician.

Next, I have started to explore Nietzsche's perspectivism and its relation with the doctrine of will to power. I have firstly presented Nietzsche's conception of the world as becoming through the power struggles of power centers with a special emphasis on their relation with each other and on the dynamic character of this relation as the source of the continuous change, which makes the world a becoming world. Next, I have furthered my investigation of

the relation among the power centers on the level of power struggle. My investigation has resulted in a comprehensive elaboration of the concept of interpretation. According to Nietzsche, power increase occurs through interpretation. However, the term interpretation is not used in its ordinary meaning. That is, Nietzsche designates interpretation as the process in which a power center actively shapes, structures, assimilates, and determines the world from the perspective of its power increase. Actually, this is the only relation that exists in the world of becoming. Power centers know both the neighboring power centers and the world from this perspective. Since there is a continuous change in the world, there is no objective reality of which a power center could attain absolute knowledge; hence, a power center could know the world from its own perspective; referring to this fact, Nietzsche criticizes our understanding of truth as its being absolute and universal. Hence, I have explored his critique of traditional understanding of truth, which presupposes a stable and ordered world through Nietzsche's critiques of logic, subject-object, apparent-real world distinctions, and causality, all of which belongs to the notion of a stable world. In the course of these critiques, I have emphasized that Nietzsche refutes the notion of a stable world and its subsequent assumptions as being mere illusions; since they fail to represent the world in its actual existence.

Lastly, I have proceeded to investigate Nietzsche's notion of truth. First, I have tried to do away with the controversies stemming from Nietzsche's contradictory statements concerning truth. I have claimed that in those statements, in which Nietzsche praises truth, he refers to perspectival truths; whereas, in those statements, in which he rejects, he refers to absolute truths. I have noted that Nietzsche's designation of truth as something created through power struggle. For Nietzsche, truth is not something waiting to be discovered, but something created through power struggle which occurs through interpretation, in which power centers structure and shape the world and their environment. Hence, I have maintained that Nietzsche's understanding of truth is very different from our traditional understanding of truth, so it is impossible to ascribe a theory of truth to Nietzsche. However, among contemporary Nietzsche

scholars there is a tendency to put Nietzsche's perspectivism under one of the established truth theories, such as correspondence, pragmatic or coherence theories. Since it is the most popular one, I have concentrated upon correspondence theory, and discussed it through Clark's argumentation which she put forward in attributing correspondence theory to Nietzsche. Clark's argument for correspondence theory depends on Tarski's Convention T and the equivalence principle derived from it. Using Nietzsche's genealogical analysis of language presented in TL, I have shown the inappropriateness of Clark's argumentation; I have also shown that since her rejections of pragmatic and coherence theories are based on equivalence principle, they are also inappropriate. Furthermore, I have noted that Clark has not referred to any of Nietzsche's texts during her argumentation. This attitude exemplifies the general tendency of analytic scholars.

Finally, I have claimed that neither of these truth theories could be Nietzsche's truth theory. Since through my studies of Nietzsche's texts, I have noted that his aim is not to offer us a truth theory, but to show that clinging to absolute truths is inimical to life in the sense that it prevents us from leading a richer and fuller life. This is already evident in his doctrine of will to power, in which he conceives of the world as the world of becoming or as the chaotic world of power quanta. In such a world, every statement will have become false as soon as it is uttered. Since the world is in a constant flux, static concepts are inadequate for expressing this dynamic world. This is why Nietzsche calls our absolute truths as illusions and forces us to search for another conception and criterion of truth. This new conception and criterion of truth is already inherent in his doctrine of will to power, which is related to his perspectivism. According to this new conception of truth, there is only perspectival seeing and knowing, and the criterion is the increase of power. In the world of becoming, in which there is a constant change resulting from the power struggles of power centers, any power increase could only occur through interpretation. This means, for Nietzsche, actively shaping, structuring and assimilating the world. Thus, in this world, not every interpretation results in a power increase, but only the better

ones do. However, this process of interpretation is not to be understood as a subjective process, since there is no subject separated from its activities. That is, a thing is simply what it does; there is no distinction between the doer and the deed. In short, there is not a subject as interpreter, or an agent of the process of interpretation. Furthermore, interpretation is a continuous process; since every interpretation brings a change in the world and this changed world needs new interpretations. It is not our illusory absolute truths and theories trying to produce such truths, but this continuous process of interpretation, enriches our lives.

During the preparation of my dissertation, other than the difficulties and complexities of the topic, there has been an idea that ceaselessly haunted me; I was afraid of being unfaithful to, or distorting Nietzsche's thoughts. Especially, his following call nearly became a nightmare for me: "*Hear me! For I am such and such a person. Above all, do not mistake me for someone else.*"⁴⁷¹ I hope I did not!

⁴⁷¹ EH, Preface, §1, p. 217.

REFERENCES

- “Double-ganger.” In *Oxford English Dictionary* (online version), accessed January 11, 2007, from <http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50068997>.
- “Procrustes.” In *Encyclopædia Britannica*, accessed December 25, 2006, from Encyclopædia Britannica Online: <http://search.eb.com/eb/article-9061475>.
- “Pseudopodium.” *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., CD-ROM, version 1.14, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Ansell-Pearson, Keith. *Viroid Life: Perspectives on Nietzsche and the Transhuman Condition*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Ariew, Andre, Cummins, Robert, and Perlman, Mark. *Functions : New Essays in the Philosophy of Psychology and Biology*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. Trans. by W. D. Ross. In *World's Greatest Classic Books*, CDRom, Version 1.00.021, Corel Corporation, 1995.
- Austin, John L. *Philosophical Papers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Babich, Babette E. “Heidegger's Relation to Nietzsche's Thinking: On Connivance, Nihilism, and Value.” *New Nietzsche Studies* 3: 1/2 (Winter 1999): 23-52. (Electronic version). Accessed August 28, 2006, from <http://www.fordham.edu/philosophy/lc/babich/connive.htm>.
- Babich, Babette E. “On the Analytic-Continental Divide in Philosophy: Nietzsche's Lying Truth, Heidegger's Speaking Language, and Philosophy.” In *A House Divided: Comparing Analytic and Continental Philosophy*, ed. C. G. Prado, New York: Humanity Books, 2003.
- Babich, Babette E. *Nietzsche's Philosophy Science: Reflecting Science on the Ground of Art and Life*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.
- Blanshard, Brand. *Nature of Thought*, vol. 2. London: Allen & Unwin, 1939.

- Brobjer, Thomas H. "Nietzsche's Reading and Knowledge of Natural Science: An Overview." In *Nietzsche and Science*, eds. Gregory Moore and Thomas H. Brobjer, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2004.
- Clark, Maudemarie. *Nietzsche on Truth and Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Cox, Christoph. *Nietzsche: Naturalism and Interpretation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Cunningham, G. Watts. "On Nietzsche's Doctrine of the Will to Power." *The Philosophical Review*, 28:5 (1919): 479-490.
- Danto, Arthur. *Nietzsche as Philosopher*. Expanded edition. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Darwin, Charles. *Descent of Man*. New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 2004.
- Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1947.
- Davidson, Donald. "A Coherence Theory of Truth and Knowledge." In *Kant oder Hegel*, ed. Dieter Heinrich, Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1984.
- Delcaro, Adrian. *Grounding the Nietzsche Rhetoric on Earth*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Dennett, Daniel. *Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meanings of Life*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Etchemendy, John. *The Concept of Logical Consequence*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Gemes, Ken. "Nietzsche's Critique of Truth." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 52:1 (1992): 47-65.
- Green, Michael Steven. *Nietzsche and the Transcendental Tradition*. Illinois: Illinois University Press, 2002.
- Grimm, Ruediger H. *Nietzsche's Theory of Knowledge*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. *Nick of Time: Politics, Evolution, And The Untimely*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2004.

- Hales, Steven D. and Welshon, Rex. *Nietzsche's Perspectivism*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000.
- Heidegger, Martin. "Plato's Doctrine of Truth." Trans. Thomas Sheehan, in *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeill, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Heidegger, Martin. "The Word of Nietzsche: 'God is Dead.'" In *The Question Concerning Technology, and Other Essays*, trans. by William Lowitt, New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, trans. by John Macquairre & Edward Robinson, New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1962.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Nietzsche*. Vol. I. Trans. David Farrell Krell, San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Nietzsche*. Vol. III. Trans. David Farrell Krell, San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Nietzsche*. Vol. IV. Trans. David Farrell Krell, San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991.
- Heidegger, Martin. *The Question Concerning Technology, and Other Essays*. Trans. William Lowitt, New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
- Heidegger, Martin. *What is Called Thinking*. Trans. by J. Glenn Gray, New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Howard, Jonathan. *Darwin: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*. Ed. Tom L. Beauchamp, New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Johnson, Dirk Robert. "Nietzsche's Early Darwinism: The 'David Strauss' Essay of 1873." *Nietzsche-Studien*, 30 (2001): 62-79.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. Norman Kemp Smith, New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- Kaufmann, Walter. *Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Buber: Discovering the Mind*. Vol. 2, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1991.
- Kirkham, Richard L. "Truth, Correspondence Theory of." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Version 1.0, London and New York: Routledge, 1998.

- Leiter, Brian. "Memorandum." May 2003. Accessed August 18, 2006, from <http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/Nietmemo.htm>.
- Leiter, Brian. *The Future for Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Lichtenberg, George Christoph. *The Waste Books*. Trans. R. J. Hollingdale, New York: New York Review Books, 2000.
- Magnus, Bernd. "The Use and Abuse of *The Will to Power*." In *Reading Nietzsche*, eds. Robert C. Solomon, Kathleen M. Higgins. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Magnus, Bernd. *Heidegger's Metahistory of philosophy: Amor Fati, Being and Truth*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1970.
- Malthus, Thomas. *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. Ed. Geoffrey Gilbert, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Müller-Lauter, Wolfgang. *Nietzsche: his philosophy of contradictions and the contradictions of his philosophy*. Trans. by David J. Parent, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "On Truth and Lies in a Nonmoral Sense." Trans. by Daniel Breazeale in *Philosophy and Truth: selections from Nietzsche's notebooks of the early 1870's*, New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1979.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Beyond Good and Evil*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann, New York: Vintage Books, 1989.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Daybreak*. Eds. Maudemarie Clark and Brian Leiter, trans. R. J. Hollingdale, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Ecce Homo*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann, New York: Vintage Books, 1967.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Human, All too Human*. Cambridge: trans. R. J. Hollingdale, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morals*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann, New York: Vintage Books, 1967.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Philosophy in the Tragic Age of the Greeks*. Trans. Marianne Cowan, Washington: Regnery Publishing Inc., 2001.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Antichrist*. In *The Portable Nietzsche*, ed. and trans. Walter Kaufmann, New York: Penguin Books, 1976.

- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Birth of Tragedy*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann, New York: Vintage Books, 1967.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Gay Science*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann, New York: Vintage Books, 1974.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Will to Power*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale, New York: Vintage Books, 1968.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. In *The Portable Nietzsche*, ed. and trans. Walter Kaufmann, New York: Penguin Books, 1976.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Twilight of the Idols*. In *The Portable Nietzsche*, ed. and trans. Walter Kaufmann, New York: Penguin Books, 1976.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Writings from the Late Notebooks*. Trans. Kate Sturge, ed. Rüdiger Bittner, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Nola, Robert. "Nietzsche's Theory of Truth and Belief." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 47:4 (1987): 525-562.
- Pippin, Robert B. "Nietzsche, Heidegger, and the Metaphysics of Modernity." In *Nietzsche and Modern German Thought*, ed. Keith Ansell-Pearson, London: Routledge, 1991.
- Plato. *Plato's Republic*. Trans. Benjamin Jowett, ed. Albert A. Anderson, Massachusetts: Agora Publications Inc., 2001.
- Poellner, Peter. *Nietzsche and Metaphysics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Quine, W. V. O. *From a Logical Point of View*. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.
- Rescher, Nicholas. *The Coherence Theory of Truth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Richardson, John. *Nietzsche's System*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Sallis, John. "Nietzsche's Underworld of Truth." *Philosophy Today*, 16:1 (1972): 12-19.
- Schacht, Richard. *Nietzsche*. London: Routledge, 1985.
- Schlechta, Karl. *Der Fall Nietzsche: Aufsätze und Vorträge*. Munich, 1959.
- Schrift, Alan D. *Nietzsche and the Question of Interpretation: between hermeneutics and deconstruction*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

- Solomon, Robert C., and Higgins, Kathleen M. *What Nietzsche Really Said*. New York: Random House, 2000.
- Spinoza, Benedict de. *The Philosophy Of Spinoza Selected From His Chief Works*. New York: Kessinger Publishing Company, 2004.
- Spir, Afrikan Alexandrovich. *Denken und Wirklichkeit: Versuch einer Erneuerung der kritischen Philosophie*. Leipzig: J. G. Findel, 1873.
- Stack, George J. "Nietzsche and Perspectival Interpretation." *Philosophy Today*, 25:3 (1981): 221-241.
- Stack, George J. *Lange and Nietzsche*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1983.
- Strong, Tracy B. "Language and Nihilism: Nietzsche's Critique of Epistemology." *Theory and Society*, 3 (1976): 239-263.
- Strong, Tracy B. "Text and Pretexts: Reflections on Perspectivism in Nietzsche." *Political Theory*, 13:2 (1985): 164-182.
- Taylor, Charles. *The Explanation of Behaviour*. London: Daedalus Books, 1964.
- Vorzimmer, Peter J. *Charles Darwin: The Years of Controversy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970.
- Waite, Geoff. *Nietzsche's Corps/E: Aesthetics, Politics, Prophecy, Or, the Spectacular Technoculture of Everyday Life*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1996.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TURKISH SUMMARY

Nietzsche'nin doğruluk, bilgi, ve epistemoloji konularındaki düşünceleri, uzunca bir süre ahlak, Hristiyanlık, nihilizm, politika, kadınlar, Üstinsan (*Übermensch*), vb. konular hakkındaki düşüncelerinin gölgesinde kalmış olsa da, Nietzsche çalışmalarının yeni konuları olmaya başladılar. Nietzsche'nin ikinci gruptaki konular hakkındaki düşünceleri üzerine yorumlarda da karşılaştığımız gibi, birinci gruptaki konulara ilişkin düşüncelerinin yorumlarında da anlaşmazlıklar mevcuttur. Bazıları Nietzsche'nin doğruluk ve bilgi hakkındaki düşüncelerinin sadece çelişkili aforizmaların bir toplamı olduklarını ve açık bir şekilde ifade edilmemiş düşünceler olduklarını söyleyerek reddederken, bazıları ise, bu aforizmalarda bizim doğruluk ve bilgi anlayışımızla ilgili özgün bir şeyler olduğunu iddia etmişlerdir.

Nietzsche'nin doğruluk ve bilgi hakkındaki düşüncelerinin doğası ve değeri ile ilgili görüşler arasındaki bu kutuplaşmalar, konu hakkındaki incelemeler derinleştirildiğinde daha da artar. Örneğin, ortaya *Nachlaß* (yayımlanmamış yazılar) sorunu çıkar; araştırmalarda *Nachlaß* göz önünde bulundurulmalı mı yoksa bulundurulmamalı mıdır? Çünkü Nietzsche'nin doğruluk ve bilgi hakkındaki düşüncelerini ortaya koyduğu aforizmaların çoğu *Nachlaß*'ın içerisinde. Bazı yorumcular Nietzsche bu yazıları yaşarken yayımlamadığı için geçerli kaynak olarak kabul etmezken, diğer bazı yorumcular Nietzsche'nin gerçek felsefesinin bu yazılarda olduğunu iddia ederek bu yazıları geçerli bir kaynak olarak kabul ederler.

Uygun yazıların kaynak olarak seçilmesi problemi dışında, felsefi konulardan kaynaklardan başkaca anlaşmazlıklar da vardır. Örneğin, güç istenci öğretisinin metafizik, ereksel (*teleological*), yada Darwinci bir ilke olarak mı ele alınacağı; perspektivizmin bir tür görecilik olup olmadığı; Nietzsche'nin doğruluk anlayışının bir doğruluk kuramını imleyip imlemediği, vb. Nietzsche yorumcuları arasındaki diğer önemli anlaşmazlık kaynaklarıdır. Bunlardan dolayıdır ki, Nietzsche'nin doğruluk, bilgi ve epistemoloji hakkındaki düşünceleri Nietzsche çalışmalarında yeni sayılabilecek bir araştırma alanı olmalarına rağmen, oldukça karmaşık ve tartışmalı bir konu haline gelmiştir; öyle ki, neredeyse her yorumcunun kendine ait bir Nietzsche'si var.

Bunlara ek olarak, Nietzsche'nin üslubu ve dili kullanışı anlaşmazlıkları artıran ve her şeyi daha da karmaşık hale getiren diğer unsurlardır. Nietzsche açıkça sunulmuş ve adım adım ilerleyen akıl yürütmeler kullanmaz; aksine, düşüncelerini ifade etmek için metaforlar ve aforizmalar kullanır. Dahası, Nietzsche sözcükleri ve kavramları bizim alıştığımız şekilde kullanmaz; sözcüklerle oynar, dilin belirlenmiş kurallarını bozar. Çünkü, Nietzsche dilin doğasında düzenli ve değişmez bir dünya anlayışını varsayan bir metafizik olduğuna ve dilin güç mücadelesi nedeniyle her şeyin sürekli bir akış içinde olduğu dünya tasarımına dayanan kendi düşüncelerini ifade edemeyeceğine inanır. Oysaki, çağdaş Nietzsche yorumcularının çoğu Nietzsche'nin dil kullanımındaki bu farklılıkları göz önünde bulundurmazlar. Bundan dolayı da, Nietzsche'nin söylemeye çalıştığı şeyleri yanlış anlar ya da yanlış yorumlarlar. Diğer bir deyişle, çağdaş Nietzsche yorumcularının tümü olmasa da çoğu analitik gelenekten geldikleri ve Nietzsche'nin söylediklerini dilsel ya da mantıksal analiz ile anlamaya çalıştıkları için, Nietzsche'nin dil kullanımındaki nüans ve inceliklerin felsefesi için olan anlam ve önemini kavramayı başaramazlar. Bu başarısızlık yorumcuların Nietzsche'nin tam da sürekli olarak reddettiği şeyleri Nietzsche'ye atfetmelerine neden olur; örneğin, metafizik, ereksellik (*teleology*) ve karşılıklılık doğruluk kuramı (*correspondence theory of truth*).

Nietzsche'nin doğruluk ve bilgi hakkındaki düşüncelerini inceleyen günümüz Nietzsche çalışmalarının bu tartışmalı ve karmaşık durumu çok

önemlidir. Ayrıca, Nietzsche gibi açıkça felsefe tarihindeki gelmiş geçmiş en analitik olmayan (*un-analytical*) ya da en analitik karşıtı (*anti-analytical*) filozofunu, analitik gelenekten gelen yorumcuların anlamaya çalıştıklarını görmek de oldukça ilginçtir. Bundan dolayı, yukarıda bahsettiğim tartışmaların ve karmaşıklıkların çözümüne bir katkıda bulunmasını ümit ederek, Nietzsche'nin doğruluk ve bilgi hakkındaki düşüncelerini inceleyen bu tezi sunuyorum. Bununla birlikte, giriştiğim görevin zorluğunun farkındayım.

Detaylara geçmeden önce, incelemem sırasında yaptığım bazı stratejik seçimlerden söz etmek istiyorum. Her şeyden önce, güç istencinin Nietzsche'nin doğruluk ve bilgi hakkındaki düşüncelerini anlamadaki anahtar kavram olduğuna inandığım ve Nietzsche'nin bu kavramla ilgili düşüncelerinin çoğu da *Nachlaß*'ta olduğu için, *Nachlaß*'ın *The Will to Power* (*Güç İstenci*) başlığı altında yayımlanan bölümünü ana referans kaynağı olarak seçtim. İkinci olarak, Nietzsche'nin düşüncelerinin ve temel kavramlarının kökleri konusundaki tartışmaların detaylarına girmektense, Nietzsche'nin düşünce ve kavramlarını hem yayımlanmış hem de yayımlanmamış eserlerinde ortaya koyduğu şekliyle sunmayı tercih ettim, ve sonra da bu düşünce ve kavramların Nietzsche yorumcuları tarafından yapılan yorumları incelemeyi ve değerlendirmeyi tercih ettim. Son olarak da, çalışmamı Nietzsche'nin doğruluk ve bilgi hakkındaki düşüncelerinin incelendiği, başlıkları “Güç İstenci,” “Perspektivizm,” ve “Doğruluk” olmak üzere üç ana bölüme ayırdım.

Güç İstenci başlıklı bölümde, Nietzsche'nin güç istenci kavramını eserlerinde ortaya konulduğu şekliyle sunmaya çalıştım. Yukarıda da bahsettiğim gibi, Nietzsche yorumcuları arasında *Nachlaß* notlarının ve *The Will to Power* kitabının geçerli kaynaklar olup olamayacağı konusunda bir anlaşmazlık olduğu için, bu problemi kısaca özetleyerek başladım. *Nachlaß* notlarının geçerliliği sorunu Nietzsche'nin doğruluk ve bilgi hakkındaki düşüncelerini incelerken belirleyici bir unsur olarak ortaya çıkıyor; şöyle ki, eğer bu notların meşruiyetini reddederseniz, Nietzsche'nin bu konular hakkındaki düşüncelerinin önemli bir bölümünü kaçırmış olursunuz. Bu çalışmanın ele aldığı ana sorun Nietzsche'nin doğruluk ve bilgi hakkındaki düşünceleri olduğu için, ben *Nachlaß* notlarının

geçerliliğini kabul etmek zorundayım. Bu nedenle, kısaca sorunun doğasından bahsedip, bazı önemli ve popüler Nietzsche yorumcularının bu yayımlanmamış notlara yaklaşımlarını sundum.

Daha sonra, güç istenci öğretisinin kapsamlı bir açıklamasını vermeye çalıştım. Çalışmalarım sırasında şunu fark ettim, Nietzsche yorumcuları güç istenci kavramını ve bu kavramın Nietzsche'nin felsefesi için olan önemini ya anlamıyorlar ya da yanlış anlıyorlar. Bu kavramın önemini anlamadan, Nietzsche'nin felsefesindeki ve dil kullanımındaki özgünlüğü ve incelikleri kavramak olanaksızdır. Bununla birlikte, ne yayımlanmış ne de yayımlanmamış eserlerinde kavramın açık bir tanımını bulamayız; sadece Nietzsche'nin güç istenci kavramıyla ne anlatmaya çalıştığına ilişkin bize fikir verebilecek pasajlar ve aforizmalar vardır. Diğer bir ifadeyle, kavramın kısa bir tanımını vermek yerine, Nietzsche kavramı, dünyanın nasıl hepsi birer güç istenci olan dinamik güç ölçülerinden (*quanta*) meydana geldiğini göstererek açıklamaya çalışır.

Nietzsche'ye göre, her şey sadece güç istencidir; yani, var olan her şey, ya bir güç ölçüsü ya da bu ölçülerin oluşturduğu bir birlik olan, güç odaklarıdır (*power center*). Her bir güç odağı, bir güç istenci olarak, kendi gücünü artırmaya çalışır. Bir güç odağı kendi gücünü artırabilmek için diğer tüm güç odaklarıyla sürekli bir mücadele içerisinde; çünkü, güç artışı sadece diğerlerinin gücü pahasına olanaklıdır. Yani, güç artışı diğer güç odaklarının özümsemesi, mal edilmesi, ve egemenlik altına alınması yoluyla gerçekleşir. Bundan dolayı, dünyada süre giden bir güç mücadelesi vardır. Nietzsche'ye göre, bu sürekli güç mücadelesinin sonucu olarak, dünya sürekli bir akış (*flux*) içerisinde; bu güç mücadelesi sırasında her bir güç odağı değiştiği, yani gücü azaldığı ya da arttığı için, dünya sürekli değişir. Bu nedenle, Nietzsche için dünya varlık dünyası (*world of being*) değil de oluş dünyasıdır (*world of becoming*).

Ayrıca, gücü istemek ya da onun için mücadele etmek güç odaklarının dışında kalan bir şey değildir; yani, güç istenci güç odaklarının özel bir özelliğidir. Nietzsche eyleyen ile eylem arasındaki ayrımı reddeder; çünkü bu ayrım, Nietzsche'nin reddettiği başka bir ayrıma, özne-nesne ayrımına yol açar. Dünya sürekli değişim halinde olduğu için, dünyada sabit ve hareketsiz bir şey

var olamaz. Fakat, bir eylemi ya da fiili eyleyen ve eylem olarak ikiye ayırmak eylemlerinden bağımsız ve sabit olan bir öznenin var olduğu anlamına gelir. Nietzsche'ye göre, böyle bir ayrım olanaksızdır ve bir nesne ne yapıyorsa tam da o yatığı şeydir; diğer bir ifadeyle, eylemleri dışında bir nesnenin varlığını hissedemeyiz. Güç istenci bu anlamda bir güç odağının özsel bir özelliğidir; bir güç odağı yaptığı ya da eylediği şey, yani, güç istenci ya da güç mücadelesidir. Güç istenci öğretisinin akılda tutulması gereken diğer bir önemli özelliği de budur.

Güç mücadeleleri sırasında, güç odakları siyasi federasyonlara benzeyen güç birlikleri oluşturabilirler. Bu birlik içerisinde, güç odakları bir yandan birbirleriyle birlik içerisinde güçlerini artırmak için güç mücadelesi yürütürken, diğer taraftan da birliğin gücünü artırmak için diğer güç odaklarıyla bir güç mücadelesi sürdürürler; Nietzsche'ye göre, beden ya da karmaşık bir organizma böyle bir güç birliğidir. Güç istenci öğretisi ve Darwinizm arasındaki ilişkiyi incelerken de gördüğümüz gibi, Nietzsche organların oluşumunun birlik ya da organizmayı oluşturan bireysel güç odaklarının kendi aralarındaki güç mücadelesi sonucu gerçekleştiğini iddia eder. Böylelikle, güç mücadelesi her yerde ve her zaman bir kesintiye uğramadan ya da kalıcı uzlaşmaya varmadan devam eder. Dahası, bir güç odağı, gücünü artırma uğruna, kendi varlığını ve korunmasını (*preservation*) tehlikeye atabilir; yani, Nietzsche için güç artışı kendini-korumadan (*self-preservation*) daha önemlidir; güç istenci öğretisindeki Darwin karşıtı bir tema daha.

Nietzsche'nin güç istenci öğretisi ile ilgili diğer bir önemli nokta ise, bu öğretilerde, organik ve inorganik nesne ayrımı olmamasıdır. Nietzsche'ye göre, her iki tür nesne de güç istencidir ve aralarındaki tek fark oldukları güç miktarı arasındaki farktır. Diğer bir deyişle, her bir güç odağı birbirinden oldukları güç derecesi ile ayrılırlar. Burada şu nüansa dikkat çekmek istiyorum: “sahip olmak” (to have) fiili yerine “olmak” (to be) fiilini kullandım; çünkü, güç sahip olacağınız bir şey değildir, çünkü bir nesne tam da o güçtür, ya da bir nesne tam da o güç miktarı, ölçüsü ya da derecesidir. Bu nüans öğretisi ile ilgili bir çok anlaşmazlığın kaynaklandığı önemli bir noktadır.

Öğreti ile ilgili bu ve bunun gibi diğer önemli noktaları tartışarak, öğretinin yapısını ortaya koyduktan sonra, Nietzsche yorumcuları arasında anlaşmazlıklara yol açan öğretinin yapısı ve doğasıyla ilgili iddiaları ele alarak devam ettim.

Bazı Nietzsche yorumcuları güç istenci öğretisini Darwinci bir ilke olarak kabul ediyorlar. Fakat, böyle bir yaklaşım asıl sorunu kavrayamaz. Çünkü, aralarında bazı benzerlikler olmakla beraber, güç istenci öğretisi ile Darwinizm arasında bazı temel ve derin bazı farklılıklar vardır. Ayrıca, Nietzsche Darwin ve Darwinizmi acımasızca eleştirir; özellikle, Darwinci kavramlar olan uyum (*adaptation*), güçlü olanın hayatta kalması (*survival of the fittest*), varolma mücadelesi (*struggle for existence*), Darwin'in ahlak hakkındaki düşünceleri, ve Darwin'in evrim kuramının özünde bulunan ereksellik Nietzsche'nin eleştirilerin ana hedefleridirler. Bu eleştirilere ve güç istenci öğretilerine başvurarak, öğretinin hiçbir şekilde Darwinci bir ilke olamayacağını göstermeye çalıştım.

Daha sonra, öğretinin metafizik bir ilke olduğuna dair iddiaları ele aldım. Nietzsche, yine, kendi söylediğinin aksi iddialarla karşı karşıya kalıyor. Nietzsche her türlü metafiziği ve metafizik sistemleri durmaksızın eleştirmesine ve reddetmesine rağmen, bu durum bazı filozofları ve yorumcuları Nietzsche'nin bir metafizikçi ve güç istenci öğretisinin de metafizik bir ilke olduğunu iddia etmekten alıkoymaz. Bu metafizik suçlamalarının iki farklı ve karşıt felsefe geleneğinden geldiğini görmek oldukça ilginç bir durum; analitik felsefe ve kıta felsefesi gelenekleri. Bundan dolayı, bu iki kampın düşüncelerinden bahsetmeye kendimi mecbur hissettim. Böylece, Martin Heidegger'i kıta geleneğinin John Richardson'ı ise analitik geleneğin temsilcileri olarak seçtim. Aynı gelenekten gelen filozof ve düşünürlerin görüşleri arasında bazı temel farklılıklar olabileceği ve bu kararımın felsefi bir akıl yürütme için pek de geçerli bir yöntem olarak kabul edilemeyeceğinin farkındayım, fakat, yine de, Nietzsche'yi metafizikçi olarak bu iki farklı yorumun güç istenci düşüncesini anlamamıza katkıda bulunabileceğini düşünüyorum. İki yorumcunun iddialarını incelerken, önce onların akıl yürütmelerini sunduktan sonra bu iddia ve akıl yürütmelerin

Nietzsche'yi metafizikçi yapmak için yeterince sağlam ve inandırıcı olmadıklarını göstermeye çalıştım.

Perspektivizm başlıklı bölümde ise, Nietzsche'nin güç istenci öğretisi üzerinde temellenen perspektivizmini ele aldım. Nietzsche'nin perspektivizmindeki en önemli nokta yorum kavramıdır. Perspektivizm doğrularımızın perspektif yorumlardan başka bir şey olmadığını iddia eden bir görüş olarak özetlenebilir. Yorum sözcüğü, gündelik kullanımda, zihinsel bir eylemi işaret eder. Fakat, Nietzsche için yorum bir güç odağının gücünü kullanma ve artırma yoludur. Bir güç odağı, yorum aracılığıyla, dünyayı ve kendi çevresini kendi gücünü artıracak şekilde düzenler, şekillendirir, özümser, ve belirler; yani, her bir güç odağı dünyayı ve kendi çevresini kendi gücünü artırma perspektifinden yorumlar ya da yapılandırır. Bundan dolayıdır ki, Nietzsche dünyanın güç odaklarının kendi güçlerini artırma perspektifinden yaptıkları yorumların toplamı olduğunu ileri sürer.

Her yorum, yorum sürecine dahil olan güç odaklarının güçlerinde bir değişime yol açar; diğer bir ifadeyle, yorum gücü artırma perspektifinden yapıldığı ve güç artışı sadece diğer güç odaklarının güçlerindeki bir azalma pahasına olanaklı olduğu için, güç mücadelesi sürecinde bazı güç odaklarının gücü artarken diğerlerinininki azalır. Güç odaklarının güç miktarlarında meydana gelen bu değişim, dünyada da bir değişim olduğuna işaret eder; bu da dünyanın artık yorumun yapıldığı andaki durumunda olmadığı anlamına gelir. Bundan dolayı da, dünyanın yeniden yorumlanması gerekir. Dünyaya oluş karakterini veren, onu bir oluş dünyası yapan da işte bu kesintisiz yorum sürecidir.

Bu dinamik dünya anlayışı doğruluğu olgulara ya da gerçekliğe karşılık gelme olarak kabul eden bilişsel paradigmamızı yıkar; karşılıklılık durağan ve düzenli bir dünya anlayışını varsayar, fakat, biz şimdi sürekli akış halinde olan bir dünyaya sahibiz. Bundan dolayı, bizim dünyanın doğası ile ilgili doğrularımız hiçbir şeye karşılık gelemedikleri için birer yanılsama ya da hayal haline gelirler. Nietzsche'ye göre bütün doğrularımız sadece birer yorumdurlar, daha fazlası değil. Böylece, bu doğruları değişmeyen mutlak doğrular kabul etmek gücümüzü artırmamızı engeller. Nietzsche için, bizim bu doğrulara

yapışıp kalmamız bir korkaklık ve zayıflık işaretidir; bu mutlak doğruların hayatta kalmamızı sağladığını görüp, kendini-korumayı riske etmeyi gerektiren güç artırmayı feda ederek bu doğrulara sarılırız. Nietzsche mutlak doğruların yaşamı kısırlaştıran, hatta hadım eden, etkilerini görerek, bizi bu türden mutlak doğrulara götüren epistemolojik paradigmayı perspektivizm aracılığıyla yok etmeye çalışır.

Nietzsche perspektivizmini bir yenilik ve epistemolojimize bir alternatif olarak sunar. Nietzsche'nin yayımlanmış ya da yayımlanmamış eserlerinde, perspektivizmin açık bir tanımını bulamamak da, perspektivizm ile ne anlatmaya çalıştığını bu kavramdan bahsettiği pasajlardan anlayabiliriz. Perspektivizmin temel iddiasını şöyle özetleyebiliriz: mutlak doğruluk diye bir şey yoktur ve doğrularımızın hepsi birer perspektif yorumdur. Aslında, perspektivizm Nietzsche'nin dünyayı güç istenci öğretisi ve yorum aracılığıyla bir oluş dünyası olarak kurmasının doğrudan bir sonucu gibi görünmektedir. Dünya sürekli bir akış içerisinde olduğu için, böyle bir dünyada mutlak doğruya ulaşmanın bir yolu yoktur; bundan dolayı da, dünyaya ilişkin doğrularımız sadece gücümüzü artırma perspektifinden yaptığımız yorumlardır. Buna ek olarak, doğrularımızı perspektif yorumlar olarak gören böyle bir doğruluk anlayışı karşılıklıktan başka bir doğruluk ölçütü gerektirir. Nietzsche güç istenci öğretisi ile uyumlu bir doğruluk ölçütü ileri sürer; güç artışı. Nietzsche'ye göre, eğer bir yorum yorumu yapanın gücünü artırıyorsa doğru, aksi durumda ise yanlıştır. Bu nedenle, Nietzsche'nin perspektivizmi bizim geleneksel doğruluk anlayışımıza karşıdır ve bu anlayışın altını oyar.

Perspektivizm göreciliğe benzer gibi görünmektedir. Fakat, Nietzsche'nin dünyayı güç istenci olarak kurmasını göz önüne aldığımızda, perspektivizmin görecilik ile alakası olmadığı açıkça ortaya çıkar. Görecilik nesnel bir gerçekliğin var olduğunu kabul eder ve bu nesnel gerçekliğin hiç kimsenin erişemeyeceği bir bakış açısından ulaşılabilir olduğunu iddia eder; bu nedenle, görecilik için bu nesnel gerçekliğe ilişkin tüm inançların ve fikirlerin hepsi, yanlış olmaları anlamında, eşit derecede doğrudur. Fakat, güç istenci öğretisi bizim nesnel gerçekliğin varlığından ve onun bilgisinin ulaşılabilirliğinden söz

etmemizi olanaksız kılar. Ayrıca, Nietzsche'nin perspektivizmi iyi ve kötü yorum arasında ayırım yapabilmemize olanak sağlayan bir doğruluk ölçütüne sahiptir. Görecilik tartışmasını Peter Poelner'in Nietzsche'nin perspektivizminin bir tür görecilik olduğu iddiası üzerinden derinleştirerek sürdürdüm, ve perspektivizmin neden bir tür görecilik olamayacağını yukarıda bahsettiğim farklılıklarla birlikte Nietzsche'nin güç istenci öğretisi ve yorum kavramlarını kullanarak göstermeye çalıştım.

Perspektivizmin daha iyi anlaşılabilmesi için, Nietzsche'nin geleneksel epistemolojik paradigmanın mantık, nedensellik, özne-nesne ve gerçek-görünen dünya ayrımları gibi temel varsayım ve bileşenlerine perspektivizm temelinde getirdiği eleştirileri inceledim. Nietzsche'ye göre bu varsayımlar sadece tahmin edilebilir ve hesaplanabilir bir dünya kurabilmek için kullandığımız araçlardır ve bunlarda diğer tüm doğrularımız gibi sadece birer yorumdurlar. Böylesi bir hesaplanabilir ve tahmin edilebilir dünya, içerisinde yaşadığımız dünyanın yanlışlanması ile mümkündür. Demek oluyor ki, içerisinde tahminlerin ve hesapların işlemediği oluş dünyasını reddedip bizim varlığımızın devamının gerektirdiği koşulları sağlayacak hayali bir dünya yaratıyoruz. Örneğin, Nietzsche'ye göre, mantık eşit ve benzer nesne, olay ve durumlar gerektirir. Fakat, bu durumlar içerisinde yaşadığımız oluş dünyasında var olmadığı için bunları kendimiz yaratırız. Kategoriler yaratırız ve karşılaştığımız her nesne, olay ya da durumu tüm farklılıklarını ve değişen karakterlerini görmezden gelerek ya da yadsıyarak bu kategorilerin içerisine yerleştirmeye çalışırız. Diğer taraftan, Nietzsche mantığın temel ilkelerinden özdeşlik ve çelişmezlik ilkelerinin de bizim yarattığımız şeyler olduğunu ileri sürerek bu ilkeleri düşüncelerimizin doğruluğunu belirleyen ve deneyimden bağımsız araçlar olarak kabul etmemizi eleştirir. Aynı şekilde, nesne-özne ve gerçek-görünen dünya ayrımlarını da durağan ve değişmeyen nesneler varsaydığı için reddeder. İlk ayırimda, eylemlerinden bağımsız ve değişmeyen bir özne ve edilgin bir şekilde varolan bir nesne ortaya çıkar ki, Nietzsche'ye göre eylemeyen, hareket etmeyen ya da değişmeyen bir şey var olamaz. İkinci ayırimda ise, yine bir yorum olarak kurduğumuz ve Nietzsche'nin ileri sürdüğü oluş dünyasına oranla daha az

değişimin yaşandığı görünen dünyanın karşısına değişimin olmadığı bir gerçek dünya konulur. Fakat, Nietzsche'ye göre her iki dünya da bizim yorumumuzdan başka bir şey değildir; iki dünyayı da biz kurarız. Ayrıca, gerçek dünya diye tasarladığımız dünyaya dair hiçbir deneyimimiz yoktur ve sadece içerisinde yaşadığımız görünen dünyada deneyimlediğimiz değişimin üzerimizde yarattığı korkuyu kırabilmek ve değişimin yaşandığı bu dünyayı sahte bir dünya olarak gösterebilmek için kurduğumuz bir dünyadır. Nietzsche'ye göre, nedensellik de aynı psikolojik gereksinimlerimizi karşılamak için yarattığımız bir şeydir. İçerisinde yaşadığımız dünyada değişim vardır ve bu değişim bir düzene bağlamak, onun bir kural içerisinde gerçekleştiğini görmek bu dünyanın bizim için bildik ve güvenilir kalmasını sağlar. Bilmediğimiz ve yabancı bir durum ya da olayla karşılaştığımızda tedirgin oluruz ve onu tanıdığımız bir şey haline getirmeye çalışırız. Nietzsche'ye göre, bu yabancı olay ya da nesneleri bildiğimiz kavram ve nesneler aracılığıyla nedensellik kurgusu içerisinde açıkladığımızda bu korku ve tedirginlikten kurtuluruz. Sonuçta, bu bildik ve tanıdık kavram ve nesneler de zaten bizim daha önce yorumlayarak kurduğumuz şeyler oldukları için, bunları kullanarak tanıdık hale getirmeye çalıştığımız şeylerde bizim yorumlarımız olacaklardır. Ayrıca, Nietzsche nedenselliğin zamanın tersine çevrilmesi sonucu kurulduğunu iddia eder. Sonuç ortaya çıkmadan nedeni ortaya koyamayız; sonuç bir kez ortaya çıktıktan sonra, yine tanıdık ve bildik kavram ve nesneleri kullanarak geriye doğru nedensellik zincirini kurarız. Nietzsche'nin de söylediği gibi, sonuç ortaya çıkmadan önce, sonuç ortaya çıktıktan sonra inandığımız nedenlerden farklı nedenlere inanırız. Burada Nietzsche'nin eleştirilerini kısaca özetlemeye çalıştım, daha geniş bir inceleme tezin içerisinde mevcut, fakat Nietzsche'nin eleştirilerinin genel bir özetini vermek gerekirse, tüm bu varsayım ve araçlar tahmin edilebilir ve hesaplanabilir bir dünya kurabilmek için yarattığımız şeylerdir ve bunlar dünyanın gerçek yapısı ya da varoluşu ile hiçbir alakaları yoktur; hepsi bizim “insanca, pek insanca” yorumlarımızdan başka bir şey değildir.

Doğruluk başlıklı bölümde ise, Nietzsche'nin doğruluk hakkındaki çelişik ifadelerini, doğruluk anlayışını, ve bu doğruluk anlayışının doğruluk

kuramlarıyla olan ilişkilerini inceledim. Öncelikle, günümüz Nietzsche çalışmalarında yaşanan tartışmaların bir diğer kaynağı olan Nietzsche'nin doğruluğa ilişkin çelişik ifadelerini ele aldım. Nietzsche'nin eserlerinde doğruluğun varlığına ve değerine ilişkin hem olumlu hem de olumsuz ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Bu ifadelerden kaynaklanan çelişkinin görünürde bir çelişki olduğunu göstermeye çalıştım. Bunu yaparken de, olumlu ifadelerinde Nietzsche'nin kendi doğruluk ölçütüne uygun olarak kullandığını; yani, gelip geçici doğrulardan bahsettiğini; olumsuz ifadelerde ise, durağan bir dünya düzenini varsayan mutlak doğrulardan bahsettiğini göstermeye çalıştım.

Bu görünürde çelişkili durumu açıklığa kavuşturduktan sonra, Nietzsche'nin perspektivizminin örtük olarak karşılıklılık, pragmacı ya da uygunluk doğruluk kuramlarından birini varsayıp varsaymadığını incelemeye başladım. Karşılıklılık doğruluk kuramı günümüz Nietzsche yorumcularının sıklıkla atfettikleri kuram olduğu için, bu bölümde yoğunluklu olarak bu kuramla ilgilendim. Perspektif doğruluk ile karşılıklılık kuramının belirlediği doğruluk arasındaki temel farkları daha belirgin bir şekilde ortaya koyabilmek için perspektif doğruluk ve karşılıklılık kuramını kısaca karşılaştırdım. Daha sonra, Nietzsche'nin bir doğruluk kuramına sahip olup olmadığını Maudemarie Clark'ın Nietzsche'ye karşılıklılık kuramı atfedişini inceleyerek bulmaya çalıştım. Clark'ı seçmemin birkaç nedeni var. Birincisi, Clark'ın akıl yürütmesi oldukça ilginç ve analitik yorumcuların Nietzsche'yi ele alırken gösterdikleri eğilimleri örnekliyor: Clark, Nietzsche'ye karşılıklılık kuramını atfederken Nietzsche'nin metinlerine hiçbir gönderme yapmıyor. İkinci olarak ise, birinci ile bağlantılı olarak, Clark Nietzsche'yi karşılıklılık kuramına mahkum edebilmek için Tarski'nin *Convention T* diye bilinen anlambilimsel doğruluk kuramını (*semantic theory of truth*) ve bu kuramdan türettiği eşdeğerlik ilkesi gibi tamamıyla dilsel analize dayanan yöntemler kullanmasıdır. Üçüncü olarak da, Clark'ın Nietzsche'ye karşılıklılık kuramını atfederken kullandığı akıl yürütme boyunca eşdeğerlik ilkesini kullanarak pragmacı ve uygunluk gibi diğer rakip doğruluk kuramları da elemesidir. Bu ve bunun gibi diğer özellikler, Clark'ın akıl yürütmesini araştırmam için verimli bir konu haline getirmiştir.

Eşdeğerlik ilkesi kısaca şunu iddia eder: bir ifade ancak ve ancak söylendiği dil içerisinde doğru bir ifade ise doğrudur. Clark bu ilkeyi kullanarak Nietzsche’yi kavramları ve sözcükleri sıradan kullanımlarına uygun bir şekilde kullanmaya mahkum etmeye çalışır. Clark’ın dilsel analize dayanan uslamlamasının uygulanamaz bir şey olduğunu gösterebilmek için Nietzsche’nin “On Truth and Lies in a Nonmoral Sense,” bundan sonra TL olarak kullanılacaktır, (“Ahlakdışı Anlamda Doğruluk ve Yalan Üzerine”) isimli makalesinde ortaya koyduğu dilin soykütüğüne ilişkin analizini sundum. Bu makalede, Nietzsche dilin kökeninde bireyler arasında yapılan bir barış anlaşmasının yattığını ve doğru ve yalanın bu anlaşma tarafından belirlendiğini iddia eder; bir ifade eğer bu anlaşmanın kurallarına uygun olarak kurulmuşsa doğru, aksi takdirde yanlıştır. Bu da bize dilsel analizle bizim sadece verilen ifadenin anlaşmanın kurallarına uygun bir şekilde kurulup kurulmadığını belirlemekten başka bir şey yapamayacağımızı gösterir. Bu makalede, Nietzsche bize kullandığımız sözcük ve kavramların bir zamanlar sadece birer metafor olduklarını ve hiçbir şekilde dünyanın gerçekte olduğu biçimine karşılık gelemeyeceğini de gösterir. Bunlardan dolayı, Clark’ın uslamlaması Nietzsche’yi karşılıklı kuramcısı yapmaya yetmez. Devamında, Clark’ın pragmacı ve uygunluk doğruluk kuramlarını Nietzsche’nin kabullenebileceği kuramlar olarak eşdeğerlik ilkesini kullanarak elemesini inceledim. Bunu yaparken de, bu kuramlara Nietzsche’nin perspektivizmini kullanarak bu kuramların nasıl reddedilebileceğini araştırdım.

Son olarak, Nietzsche’nin TL makalesinde ortaya koyduğu dil ve doğruluk arasındaki ilişki hakkındaki düşüncelerini daha detaylı inceleyerek, Nietzsche’nin bir doğruluk kuramına sahip olup olmadığı sorusunu yanıtlamaya çalıştım. Bu sorunun kesin bir şekilde yanıtlanamayacak kadar zor ve karmaşık olduğunun farkındayım. Zaten Nietzsche’ye atfedilen doğruluk kuramlarının çeşitliliği de bu zorluğu gösterir niteliktedir. Her şeye rağmen, Nietzsche’yi asıl ilgilendiren şeyin bize yeni ya da varolan bir doğruluk kuramını sunmaktan çok, mutlak doğruların yaşamı olumsuzlayan etkilerini göstermek olduğuna inanıyorum. Bu nedenle, Nietzsche’ye bir doğruluk kuramı atfetmek ya da onun

ilgilendiđi řeyin sadece bize yeni ya da eski dođruluk kuramlarından birini önermek olduđunu düşünmek Nietzsche açısından kabul edilebilir bir řey değildir.

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Soysal, Soner
Nationality: Turkish (TC)
Date and Place of Birth: 30 June 1972, Sivas
Marital Status: Married
Phone: +90 352 387 1130
email: ssoysal72@gmail.com

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
MS	METU Philosophy	2002
BS	METU Philosophy	1998
High School	Mer. End. Meslek Lisesi, Kayseri	1990

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrollment
1999-2006	METU Department of Philosophy	Research Assistant
1995-1999	METU Department of Philosophy	Student Assistant

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Courses Taught
2000-2002	METU Department of Philosophy	Computer Use in Philosophy I & II

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Advanced English

PUBLICATIONS:

Articles:

Soner Soysal, "Herbert Marcuse," *Felsefe Yazın*, Sayı: 7, 2006, pp. 32-36.

Presentations:

Soner Soysal, “Bilimlere Yol Gösterici Olarak Herbert Marcuse’nin ‘Söylem Evreninin Kapanışı’ Düşüncesi,” Muğla Üniversitesi Felsefe ve Sosyal Bilimler Sempozyumu, 2005. (Published in *Felsefe ve Sosyal Bilimler: Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, Ankara: Vadi Yayınları, 2006, pp. 253-258.)

Soner Soysal, “Nietzsche’nin Perspektivist Bilgi Kuramı,” Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği 9. Ulusal Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi, 2005.